Vol I of this magazine was published under the title The Religious Cabinet.

*Library of*
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON MASS.

THE

# UNITED STATES

# CATHOLIC MAGAZINE.

JULY, 1843.

## SIGHTS AND THOUGHTS IN FOREIGN CHURCHES.

*Sights and Thoughts in Foreign Churches, and among Foreign Peoples.* By Frederick William Faber, M. A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. London, 1843.

THIS is altogether a very remarkable book. It exhibits a distinctive character, and is stamped with the impress of the new Oxford opinions. We have seen these opinions industriously circulated through the various channels of the familiar tract, the grave and didactic treatise, and the more attractive melody of verse; it remained to vary the medium and occupy the only yet untrodden ground, by the production of a volume of travels, through such "foreign churches and foreign peoples," as were likely to afford scope for a display of the new theology—or rather of an old theology revived; for, to use Mr. Faber's own words, "there is a daily and incessant resurrection of opinions." And he adds: "the seeds of the middle ages have been long deposited in the fertile mould of neglect and disbelief. They are now beginning to swell and split under ground. You will see their green shoots parting the dull mould shortly."

Our traveller takes for his motto two verses of the epistle to the Hebrews (x, 24, 25), "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: exhorting one another: and *so much the more as ye see the day approaching.*" The book is dated "Ambleside, the feast of St. Matthias," and inscribed to Wordsworth, the poet, "in affectionate remembrance of much personal kindness, and many thoughtful conversations on the rites, prerogatives and doctrines of the holy Church." The opening is pleasing and appropriate.

"The traveller in the middle ages rose with the religious men beneath whose roof he had found shelter for the night; with them he sought, first of all, the house, oftentimes the altar of God, and joined in the matin service of the western Church. He went forward on his road with prayer and benediction. *Prosperum iter*—a prosperous journey! was the kind monks' farewell, *faciat tibi Deus salutarium nostrorum: utinam dirigantur viæ tuæ ad custodiendas justificationes Dei!* and from field, and brook, and bush, the salutation still for miles came forth, haunting his ear, *Procedas in pace, in nomine Domini*—go in peace, in the name of the Lord! A cloud of good wishes accompanied and guarded him from monastery to monastery, while the courts of bishops and the cloisters of learned men were opened to him, by the commendatory letters of his native prelates. The traveller of those times had some solid advantages which a churchman now-a-days may be allowed to regret. The Church Catholic, her fortunes and in-

terests, are not probably uppermost in the minds of the great bulk of modern travellers, and they of course will not miss that unity and brotherly intercourse, or that religious character imparted to their wanderings, which were so much prized of old. But they who are accustomed to believe and act as if they were a Church, and one Church only, and to deem each little fact and symptom connected with her as of more importance than political statistics, or the critical observations of the artist, will acknowledge both their profit and their pleasure to have been marred in no slight degree by the absence of those privileges of Christian communion so richly dealt out of old to travellers. There were a hundred little needs, interesting the affections and laying hold on the imagination which we remember, and with fond envy many times recapitulate, satisfied to the full for those who travelled in Christendom when at unity with itself, but now utterly unsatisfied for modern travellers, amid the jealous and disjointed churches. The traveller of past times was sure of a home for Easter or Whitsuntide; the continual haunting of sacred places was, as it were, a safeguard against the fresh shapes and daily transformed temptations of sin, to which a traveller is exposed; he had holy houses every where, as refuges in times of weariness or pestilence, and a certainty, in case death should intercept him, of a consecrated resting place among the Christian dead, when he had passed through the narrow gate, aided by the offices and absolutions of the Church. And these *were* consolations, great or small, according to the degree in which he realized the powers of the Church, and the blessedness of being her son. Indeed, the disuse of the universal language of Europe, namely, the Latin of the middle ages, while it enhances the difficulty of communication with good men of foreign communions, may be regarded as an image of the present broken and disordered state of Christendom. However diversified might be the customs of the regions which the traveller visited, let him enter the portal of the Church, or hear the voice of the minister of the Gospel, and he was present with his own, though Alps and oceans might sever them asunder. There was one spot where the pilgrim always found his home. They were all one people, when they came before the altar of the Lord."

Of the views by which Mr. Faber was actuated in undertaking the tour before us, we have his own account, and powerfully is it set forth.

"I would fain regard the earth as a volume, where God's judgments and his mercies are luminously recorded. I would strive to cherish a more earnest Catholic spirit in interpreting what I see, and constrain each famous locality to give a voice and a soul to my dumb and spiritless recollection of history. Unfortunately I loathe books and in-doors pursuit of knowledge. I cannot profit in that school. I toil irksomely, and yet toil vainly. The restraints of scholarship are not sweet restraints to me. What I read seems but a bewildering mass of ill-strung facts. I would put life into it all, by making for myself a sacred geography of this very fearful earth. Dumb cities should speak to me, interpreting the past, and put threads into my hands, whereby I may guide myself a little way, and with a timid soberness, into the profitable labyrinth of prophecy. The earth surely has a Catholic geography as well as a moral and physical one, and no less scientific; and if physical geography be one of the most alluring and fertile of all studies; what must Catholic geography be? . . . . The difference between truth in a book, and truth on the tongue, or truth in the immense prophetic hieroglyphics of the earth, is very great. What is it to sit in your solitary library, and open the service-book, and read the Nicene creed,—are you not reading truth? Yea, verily, eternal, immutable truth: there is no denying it. But what is it to be in some old and curious cathedral, fenced round with low browed arches, and in the gloom of stained windows, to stand in a ring of new made priests, in the venerable presence of one of the visible heads of the Catholic Church, who has just been handing on the apostolic keys and living tradition,—to behold him standing with his eyes fixed on the chequered mar-

ble of the altar-steps, encompassed by the goodly sons whom he has just begotten for the Church, of veritable apostolic vine, and to hear the organ and the choir burst forth in a loud tumult of austerest music with the symbol of the Nicene council—what is it, I say, but to have each line and word of those Catholic verities graven with a style of flame upon your hearts."

In harmony with the above are the reflections that follow. In more senses than one this is a powerful passage.

"It is an awe-inspiring privilege, if a man would only intelligibly use it, to wander up and down the broad continent, whose very countenance is seamed and furrowed by the lines of God's past providences and the potent action of his already accomplished decrees, to take up here and there the links of some tremendous chain of mysterious arrangements, to gaze on the fair faces of old cities, whose character and fortunes have been distinct, peculiar, and each subserving, in this or that age, the cause of the Catholic Church of Christ. Is there not, to a Christian mind, something very solemn and subduing in such spots as Paris, Avignon, Trent, Nice, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem? Are they not all places where steps were taken which gave a peculiar shape and form to the Church? And not only is it a solemn thing to read the face of Christendom, whose cities are each words to be spelled out, telling secrets of the past, and having the foot marks of the Invisible not yet worn out of their streets, when he passed there with his Church to guard her and see her through; but it is a solemn thing from books, conversation with strangers, the kindling of thought in stirring localities, which we may hope is sometimes overruled to the discovery of truth, and from other sources to watch and take the shape and bearings of those huge masses of cloud which are casting here and there such ponderous prophetic shadows upon the Church, in motion here, and there at rest, dipping earthwards here, because of sin, and there drawn awhile upwards, because of local prayer and holiness. It is a sight to make such a push within one's soul, as though a little thought, or a restless thought, or any impure thought, might never inhabit there again, but be forevermore dislodged. Judgment has been done upon Asia; it seems still pausing over Europe. Only at a few epochs has the Church been so awfully, so deeply, with such vivid contrasts, chequered with light and shade as it is now; and oh! how painfully one longs to know what may be the fortunes of our little, separated, tempest-tossed island-mother!"

Such are the views and such the spirit in which Mr. Faber writes. Of course it will not be difficult to conceive that his modes of thought and manner of describing, will be very different from those of tourists, with whose productions we are familiar. They are conversant about material things, and studious only of the useful and the agreeable; Mr. Faber travels in quest of immaterial things; thought, feeling, and emotion are the objects of which he is in pursuit. Bearing this in mind, we shall the less wonder that in his long and solitary wanderings, he has caught the spirit and assumes the tone of an enthusiast. Perhaps this spirit is too conspicuous in his pages. In one instance it certainly is so.

Mr. Faber introduces his reader to a nameless and mysterious personage whom he calls "a man of the middle ages," who is made to discourse familiarly with him, and whose outward man he minutely describes. He is made to be the expounder of certain "ultra" doctrines of the Oxford school, or rather of certain *en avant* ideas, which either Mr. Faber's timidity and halting between opinions would not allow him to express, or which he did not find it convenient to do in his own person. This introduction of a visionary being at every turn, and in the midst of plain matter-of-fact occurrences, gives a certain fantastic air to Mr. Faber's work; it has the effect of an overstrained and violent mixed metaphor in the midst of a piece of plain writing, disagreeable in itself, and not likely to add to the writer's capability of inculcating truth.

Mr. Faber sketches with a bold, rapid, and graphic pencil: witness his description of Certosa. "About five miles from Pavia, stands the Certosa of Chiaravalle, beneath

the walls of which the battle of Pavia was fought. It certainly is a most gorgeous church; but it is desolate and forlorn, and in want of worshippers. The suppression of the monastery in this particular spot is to be regretted. It was one of the wholesale reforms of Joseph II, the Austrian Henry VIII; but a better man and a wiser sovereign. This house of Carthusian monks was begun by one of the Visconti, dukes of Milan, in the fourteenth century. The building of it occupied one hundred years. The whole of the interior, which is spacious and in the form of a Latin cross, is one mingled mass of marble, precious stones, brass, bronze, fresco-painting, and stained windows, most dazzling and costly. We observed much elaborate work in very precious materials, in more than one place, where it could scarcely be seen by any human eye. This is always delightful. It is very contrary to our spirit. We would as soon throw ourselves from our own steeples as do any thing elaborate, or beautiful, or costly, where it would never meet the eyes of men. How the spirit of the middle ages dwarfs this selfish unventuresome meanness.* What a refreshment it is—how grateful a reproof to wander up and down, within and without, the labyrinth of roofs in an old cathedral, as we did at Amiens, and see the toil and the cost of parts to which the eye can scarcely travel, so isolated are they in the air,—tracery, exquisitely finished images, fretwork, and the like, and all an offering of man's toil and intellect and cost to the Holy Trinity. The Certosa is a signal instance of this spirit. It is one heap of riches and of earth's most magnificent things, wrought by the deep and fertile spirit of Christian art into a wondrous symbolical offering to God, shaped after the cross of his Son. Once indeed it had a continual voice—a voice of daily and nightly liturgies, which rose up from it before the Lord perpetually. But the fiat of an Austrian emperor went forth, and from that hour there was so much less intercession upon the earth. The Certosa is now a silent sacrifice of Christian art. It is, as it were, a prayer for the dead, rising with full though speechless meaning up to heaven.

"I came out from the church, and loitered about the tranquil collegiate quadrangle in which it is situated. I remembered Petrarch's letter to some Carthusian monks, with whom he had stayed. 'My desires are fulfilled. I have been in Paradia, and seen the angels of heaven in the form of men. Happy family of Jesus Christ! How was I ravished in the contemplation of that sacred hermitage—that hallowed temple, which resounded with celestial psalmody! In the midst of these transports, in the pleasure of embracing the dear deposit I confided to your care (his brother, who had taken the habit), and in discoursing with him and with you, time ran so rapidly that I scarcely perceived its progress. I never spent shorter days or nights. I came to seek one brother, and I found a hundred. You did not treat me as a common guest. The activity and ardor with which you rendered me all sorts of services, the agreeable conversations I had with you in general and particular, made me fear I should interrupt the course of your devout exercises. I felt it was my duty to leave you; but it was with extreme pain I deprived myself of hearing those sacred oracles you deliver. It was my purpose to have made a short address to you; but I was so absorbed that I could not find a moment to think of it. In my solitude, I ruminate over that precious balm which I gathered, like the bee, from the flowers of your holy retreat.'"

Nor are Mr. Faber's moral pictures sketched with a less bold and picturesque pencil. Take an instance. He is in the ducal palace at Venice, surveying "those

* The same idea is thus beautifully enforced in Mr. Faber's description of the cathedral at Amiens. "When we had satisfied ourselves somewhat with the interior of the cathedral, we mounted to the top, and rambled all over the roofs among the exquisite pinnacles and carved work with which they are adorned. The roofs of great cathedrals generally deserve quite as narrow an inspection as the interiors; and the inspection is often as full of wonder as that of the inside, for the beauty and sumptuousness of parts of the building hidden from every eye but His to whose glory all was built, and the ken, perhaps of angels, are so alien to any thing in our modern temper, and are so frequently screened, as if with a jealous purpose, from man's praise, that they strike us even more forcibly than when lavished upon the nave or choir, where they would elevate the devotions of the worshipper, and redound to the glory of the artist, or the honor of the founder." P. 8.

infernal dungeons called the *Piombi*." He makes the enquiry, "Why is it that suffering should have a spell to fix the eye, above the power of beauty or of greatness? Is it not because the Cross is a religion of suffering, a faith of suffering, a privilege of suffering, a perfection arrived at by and through suffering only? Half an hour was enough for the ducal palace. I would gaze for hours upon those dungeon holes; gaze, and read there, as in an exhaustless volume, histories on histories of silent weary suffering, as it filed the soft heart of man away, attenuating his reason into a dull instinct, or cracked the stout heart, as you would shiver a flint. Travellers have frequent need of this lesson. There is seldom a line of glory written upon the earth's face, but a line of suffering runs parallel with it; and they who read the lustrous syllables of the one, and stop not to decypher the spotted and worn inscription of the other, get the least half of the lesson earth has to give. The power and divinity of suffering should nowhere be more consistently uppermost than in the mind of a traveller. Such a place as Venice, in such a season as passion week, would not fail to keep it fresh and strong. People do not by any means generally acknowledge the power and dignity of suffering. They misapprehend the Church and the temper of Churchmen, because they misapprehend the humiliation of the Lord, as reflected through the temper of his body, which is the Church. That humiliation is ever working, unfolding itself, and giving lustre in the temper and conduct of the Church and her sons, in all ages of the world's eventful history.

"The object of the Church's worship is the Saviour suffering; yet bold, undaunted, unshaken, unhindered in his suffering—submission towards God, and endurance towards the world. This is the double temper and disposition and spirit, which passes into the Church, and is her life and gift and power. This is the way that the humiliation of the bridegroom works itself out upon the demeanor of the bride. This is the demeanor by which she has become universal. She has conquered by submission—she has grown by suffering—she has filled the world, by emptying herself of all that was worldly within her. Her martyrs bowed their heads, and the earth was sown with their ashes, and made fruitful by their blood. Yet was she ever bold towards the world. She ceased not to teach or to preach for the command of any Sanhedrim or governor, or emperor; far less at the bidding of dogmatic science, profane literature, or uneasy philosophy; she rejoiced rather in that she was counted worthy to suffer. Such was she in primitive times. Later on, when she did not altogether remember her heritage of suffering, when she sat upon her high chair somewhat (it may be, God only knoweth), somewhat more lordly than beseemed her, when she wore a crown more shining and imperial than her ancient one of thorns, even in that day, she was bold towards the great, and yet the servant of the poor. She kept in power, not by courting the royal and noble—not by being clad in fine linen, and dwelling in kings' courts, but by overawing kings; by keeping their pride and lust, and wrath under; by breaking thrones down with a rod of iron. Yet, even when she thus in a measure forgot herself, or at least by an Englishman will be so judged to have done, there was something unworldly! something wonderful about her. To grow to greatness by despising it; to keep kings true to her by tyrannizing over them; to have princes for her slaves through fear, and not through flattery; and yet be all the while the blessed advocate of the poor and destitute, the serf, the captive, and all the forlorn ones upon earth—the world has not seen the like before. Later on still, she has been well content in every proud and learned generation to be accounted old and obsolete, and the keeper-back of improvement. She has no novelties—she grows no wiser. Her newest creed is fourteen hundred years old. She has not improved or widened her faith since that; and where are the literatures, philosophies, sciences, and political systems, which, in every generation, have risen up to supersede this old and unimproving faith? Quietly at rest with the worm-eaten skulls of the proud wise men that gave them birth. Surely, then, they are false and coward churchmen who fear for their

mother's abasement. Surely they are false and coward hearts who would not be cheered by the hope of suffering?"

Mr. Faber passed the holy week in Venice; part of that solemn season is thus described. "One Maunday Thursday we went to St. Mark's, and remained there the whole of the service, which lasted about three hours. This Thursday seems to be here, as it should be, a sort of Lenten holiday, a light shining ever in the darkness of passion-week. Flags were flying on all the ships before the quay, as well as in the square before St. Mark's. The archbishop was in the cathedral. He and his clergy were magnificently habited in vestments, of what appeared to be cloth of gold, and he had a gilded mitre on his head. There was music, but not much. All the clergy, the Austrian arch-duke, who is viceroy of Milan, and thirteen aged paupers received the holy communion, the choir chanting in a low voice the whole time. After the communion, the archbishop came into the nave, accompanied by his priests and deacons, in less magnificent attire. They took off his outer robes and girded him with a towel. He then knelt down, and washed and kissed the feet of the thirteen old paupers who had communicated. I rather expected that this ceremony would have been a little undignified, and waited for it somewhat uneasily, considering I was in church, and the eucharistic sacrifice but just over. However, it was not so in the least. It was very affecting, and quite *real;* and the people seemed to feel that it meant something real, and to all appearance, were edified by it, as I was myself. After it was over, the patriarch standing and leaning on his crosier, made a short address to the people, explaining the symbolical character of our Lord's act, and dwelling particularly on St. Peter's wish that not his feet only should be washed, but his hands and his head.

"This was the first great church ceremony we had seen since we came abroad; and *I looked in vain for the 'mummery,' disgusting repetitions, childish arrangements, and so forth, which we read of in modern travellers;* who, for the most part, know nothing of the Roman service-books, and consequently understand nothing of what is before them. A heathen might say just the same, as the Puritans *did* say of us, if they entered one of our cathedrals and saw us sit for the epistle, stand for the gospel, turn to the east at the creed, bow at the Lord's name, recite the litany at a faldstool between the porch and the altar, make crosses on babies' foreheads, lay hands on small squares of bread, or if they saw men in strange black dresses, with large white sleeves, walking up and down the aisles of a country church, touching the heads of boys and girls, or wetting the head and hand of our kings and queens with oil, or consecrating buildings and yards. There *may*, of course, be very sad mummery in Roman services, as there is very sad irreverence oftentimes in English services; such, for instance, as dressing up the altar in white cloths with the plate upon it for the holy communion, when it is not meant that there should be one, which is sometimes done in our cathedrals, where the clergy themselves are in sufficient number to communicate, and strangers who have wished to stay, have been told that it will be very inconvenient if they do so. It may be hoped there are few Roman churches where such theatrical mummery as that is practised. However, whatever be the amount of Romish mummery, the gross ignorance of ecclesiastical matters exhibited by many modern travellers, who have spoken the most confidently about it, may make us suspect their competency to be judges on the matter; when we see, that precisely the same commonplace and offensive epithets, might be applied with equal justice to us, by one who was a stranger or an enemy to our services; and whatever changes the people may wish for, the English ritual will hardly be charged with mummery. All ritual acts must, from the nature of the case, be symbolical, being either a reverential imitation of sacred acts, or the sublime inventions of antiquity, whereby the presence of God and his holy angels is recognised and preached to the people, or fit and beautiful means for affecting the imagination of the worshipper, and giving intensity to his devotions. All service, not excepting the simple and strict imi-

tation of our blessed Lord's action at the institution of the most solemn rite in the world, must be dumb-show to a looker-on, who knows nothing of what it sets forth and symbolizes; and this dumb-show such a looker-on, if he were pert and self-sufficient, would call 'mummery.' The existence of Romish mummery is or is not a fact, and must, of course, be so dealt with; and its extent also is or is not ascertainable as a fact. But the improbability of its being nearly so extensive as modern travellers represent it, is so monstrous considering that the Romanists are Christians, and Christians too at worship, that the vague epithets and round sentences, and the received puritan vocabulary of persons ignorant of breviaries and missals cannot be taken as evidence. Indeed, in these days, we may justifiably require beforehand that a traveller shall know so much of what external religion is, and what are its uses, that he can comprehend and subscribe to the simple philosophy comprised in Wordsworth's definition of it.

> 'Sacred Religion! Mother of *form* and fear,
> Dread arbitress of *mutable respect*.'"

Mr. Faber goes on to say, that "it is to be regretted extremely that it is not customary with us (the Church of England) to have the holy communion on the Thursday in passion-week, as has been the practice of the Church in all ages; it being the day on which our blessed Lord instituted that holy, life-giving mystery and powerful memorial of his death. When I saw the assembly at St. Mark's receiving the eucharist on the Thursday, I could not help feeling that they, rather than ourselves, were fulfilling the prophecy of Jeremiah, which our own Church, not theirs, has selected for the evening lesson of this Thursday. They were *literally* fulfilling it. 'They shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for *wheat* and for *wine*, and for oil, and for the young of the flock and of the herd; and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, and the young men and the old together; for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them; and make them *rejoice from their sorrow*. And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness.'"

Mr. Faber puts the following language into the mouth of his "man of the middle ages," but we may say to the author of "the Sights and Thoughts," *mutato nomine de te narratur*. "I do not wonder you should envy the Latin service-books; for any thing more elevating and magnificent than the western ritual is not to be conceived. There is not such another glory upon the earth. It gives to men the tongues of angels—it images on its bosom the attitudes of heaven, and it catches glorious echoes from the eternal worship of the Lamb. It has a language of its own—a language of symbols more luminous, more mystical, more widely spread, than any other language on the earth. I do not wonder you should envy the Latin ritual." And again: "old Fuller says, that 'men unsettled in their religion, are ravished at the first Popish church they enter.' I would say the reverse of this. So far is one from being 'ravished at the sight,' that the service is, so far as I know, distasteful and almost offensive. Nearly the whole of my second journey on the continent, and that too amidst the ecclesiastical magnificence of Belgium, had elapsed before I became at all reconciled to it. The danger, if danger there can really be, to an intelligent and well-disciplined Anglican, is on further acquaintance and familiarity. The attraction increases in proportion to our study of the Roman service-books. Much, well nigh all, in them is so beautiful, so solemn, so reverently bold, so full of Catholic teaching, so fitted to the deepest devotional cravings of which we are capable, and has historically been the road and training of such eminent saints, that we return almost with a feeling of disappointment and sense of lowering to our own formularies, forgetting that we have deserved lowering much further, and that the Catholic richness of the common prayer is far above our actual condition and practice. The hold which the Breviary takes upon us is strengthened, while we allow its austere hymns to raise our affections higher

than their wonted pitch, while we learn many things we know not of, from the selections of the readings, and pause over the Antiphons, where a word from one part of Scripture seems to meet another, and make a key, and open up whole mines of mystical exposition, much of it, probably, belonging to very ancient traditional treasures in the Church."

Mr. Faber's short sojourn in Milan affords him one of his richest banquets of "Sights and Thoughts." We feel that we shall satisfy our readers far more effectually by quoting the words of our traveller, than by commenting upon them: *they* can do that at their leisure.

"We have seen the far-famed cathedral of Milan, the cathedral of St. Charles Borromeo, whose praise is in all the churches. It is indeed a superb edifice, the interior is quite overpowering. It seemed, indeed, a type of the everlasting creed of the Church; for

> What is the long cathedral glade
> But faith, that in the sculptured shade
> Herself embodies to the sense,
> Leaning upon Omnipotence,
> And holiness, ennobling thought,
> Into a living temple wrought?
> There strength and beauty spring to life
> In contests of harmonious strife;
> With blended glories high aloof,
> Embracing on the gorgeous roof;
> Till standing 'neath the giant throng,
> The soul expands, and feels her strong
> With more than doth to man belong."*

"The morning mass at the tomb of St. Charles Borromeo, was just finishing when we descended into the subterranean chapel, at the entrance of the choir. We did not much regard the splendor of the tomb, for our eyes were rivetted on the *coffer* [why not shrine?] which stood above the altar, and contained the mortal remains of that holy saint and faithful shepherd. The longer we remained in the cathedral, the more its glory and magnificence, and colored gloom took possession of our spirits. *It is an oppressive thing to be a priest in the city of St. Ambrose and St. Charles Borromeo, and yet a stranger; a gazer, a mere English looker-on,—a tourist where one should be upon one's knees at home, and in that divine temple a legitimate worshipper.* But where rests the blame? Alas! the sour logic of controversy may be as convincing as it usually is to men whose minds are made up, as almost all minds are, independent of it; but since Eve tempted and Adam fell, has there ever been a strife where both sides were not to blame? In a difference so broad and complicated, so many-veined and intertwisted as that between Rome and us, never was there so monstrous a faith as that which could believe that all the wrong was with Rome, and all the right with England. Yet men have been seen with the mortal eye, who had the capacity to receive this, and put trust in it. It is distressing, truly, to be in a wonderful church, like this of Milan, to feel sure that you reverence the memory of St. Ambrose, and have deep affection for the very name of Borromeo, and are not without Christian thought for SS. Gervasius and Protasius, as much as one-half of the people you see there, *and yet be shut out from all Church offices,—to have no home at the altars of that one Church, at whose altars, by apostolic ordination, you are privileged to consecrate the Christian mysteries.*"*

"By far the most interesting thing in Milan is the Ambrosian church. The edifice itself is of the ninth century. The western doors, of old cedar wood, are said, but apparently without truth, to be the identical ones which St. Ambrose closed against Theodosius when he would have pressed into the church. But the locality is sufficient, without the identity of the doors, to awaken feelings of the deepest kind. A man truly must feel much godly emulation who is placed in the archiepiscopal chair of Milan, with two such predecessors as St. Ambrose and St. Charles. While on the stirring spot where the holy Ambrose shone forth, representing to all time the lofty character of a primitive bishop, and where Theodosius exalted his imperial dignity by sub-

* *The Cathedral*, p. 144.

* In another place he says: "The very bells with which Genoa was alive, seemed to sound reproachfully in our ears. There are churches enough to enter where we can say our secret prayers; for it is an evil thing to gaze and peep while others around you are kneeling and praying."

mission to the holy Church,—let us pass in review some of the chapters in the very interesting history of the Lombard Church."

Mr. Faber proceeds to give a rapid but animated sketch of the portion of Church history alluded to, as well as of the discovery of the relics of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, and the miracles accompanying it. Upon the latter occur the following observations:

"In respect to this narrative which rests on the high testimony of three witnesses, St. Augustin, St. Ambrose and Paulinus, are we not placed in the following dilemma? If the miracle did not take place, then St. Ambrose and St. Augustin, men of high name, said they had ascertained a fact which they did not ascertain, and said it in the face of enemies with an appeal to a whole city, and that continued and repeated during a quarter of a century. What instrument of refutation shall we devise against a case like this, neither so violently *à priori* as to supersede the apostles' testimony, nor so fastidious of evidence as to imperil Tacitus or Cæsar? On the other hand, if the miracle did take place, a certain measure of authority, more or less, surely must thereby attach to St. Ambrose, to his doctrine and life, to his ecclesiastical principles and proceedings, to the Church itself, of the fourth century, of which he is one main pillar. The miracle gives a certain sanction to three things at once:—to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to the Church's resistance to the civil power, and to the commemoration of saints and martyrs. What alternative shall the Protestant accept? Shall we retreat, or shall we advance? shall we relapse into scepticism upon all subjects, or sacrifice our deep-rooted prejudices? shall we give up our knowledge of times passed altogether, or endure to gain a knowledge which we think we have already—the knowledge of divine truth?"

In Genoa, also, Mr. Faber opens his heart to Catholic feeling. There are passages in his visit to this city which will awaken mingled emotions of pleasure and pain. Tertullian beautifully remarks that "the heart of man is naturally Christian," as a thousand spontaneous emotions will indicate. In the same manner we may say of Mr. Faber, that his heart is naturally Catholic, and would be habitually so, were it not for that leaven of the "new learning," the effect of which is to mar the better feeling which is continually struggling to be uppermost. Witness his reflections and conduct on the feast of the Annunciation: "I had thought," says he, "that all the feasts which fell in Lent were, by the Roman Church, postponed till afterwards. In Genoa this did not seem to hold with the feast of the Annunciation of our Lady. The city was plunged in one entire tumult of holiday. All the shops were shut, but booths of fruit and every kind of eatable crowded the streets. Lent seemed forgotten. The churches were thronged by men well dressed, and women almost gorgeously appareled. Bells ringing, chiming, and playing tunes without intermission all day. Genoa was a chaos of bells. All sounds of labor were hushed; the steamboats were stopped in the middle of their voyages, and every street was filled with heaps or rather stacks of flowers, wherewith to honor the images and altars of the Blessed Virgin. We ourselves were quite possessed with the Sunday feeling of the day; and not to be utterly without sympathy for the Genoese around us, we decorated our room with a bunch of crimson tulips, apparently the favorite flower, that we might not be without somewhat to remind us of her,

> 'Who so above
> All mothers shone
> The mother of
> The Blessed One.'

"The splendid ceremonials of the day recalled strongly to my mind, a very beautiful procession which I saw at Bruges, in 1839, on the octave of the Assumption, when St. Mary's image was carried through the streets, preceded by the Host, to visit St. Mary Magdalen in her church. From the general chastity of arrangement, and strikingly graceful gestures of the little children who form a portion of it, a procession is by far the most imposing of Roman ecclesiastical pageants. I see still before me

the procession of Bruges, passing along the streets, strewn with sweet flags and other herbs:

This bore the relics in a chest of gold,
On arm of that the swinging censer hung;
Another loud a tinkling hand-bell rung;
Four fathers went that ringing monk behind,
Who suited psalms of holy David sung;
Then o'er the cross a stalking sire inclined,
And banners of the Church went waving in the wind.

"Genoa probably considers herself bound to allure her sons and daughters to devote themselves more exclusively to the invocation of St. Mary; for upon her gate towards Nice, she inscribes herself, 'The City of the most holy Mary,' and M. de Genoude, in his book, expatiates with delight upon her pre-eminency among the cities of Europe, in the *culte de la Ste. Vierge*. Montalembert, in his introduction to the Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, includes among the blessings of the thirteenth century the systematizing, if not the rise of the service of the Virgin. Certainly it occupies a very prominent place in the systems of St. Dominick and St. Francis, and in the whole of that revival of religion which distinguishes the thirteenth century, an age not unfrequently misunderstood, or misrepresented, and which Mr. Gladstone, in his 'Church Principles,' a writer whose sobriety of style and thought make it very unlikely that he should have any imaginative preference for a dark age, speaks of it as a time when the soil of the Church had more vigor in throwing up great plants than at present. He instances Roger Bacon, Dante, and St. Thomas Aquinas. A study of the revival of religion in the thirteenth century would bring out singularly applicable lessons both for us, and for our Roman brethren.

"The Christian elevation of the female character so notorious in the middle ages, cannot, with any thing like historical accuracy, be linked to chivalry. It would not be hard to show that it was owing mainly to the growing reverence for the blessed mother of the Lord. It is very questionable whether chivalry went nearly so deep down into the European mind, as is often said, and many vestiges of picturesque good feeling, which interest us in later centuries, may fairly be claimed by other causes, though mostly attributed to chivalry. In addition to the influence upon female character which the reverence for St. Mary may have exercised, we must take into reckoning the amount of Christian art,—churches, statues, pictures and poetry which have sprung from devotion to her."

After all this, great indeed is our disappointment at finding Mr. Faber himself betrayed into a forgetfulness of those just and charitable principles, which, but a few pages before, we were so much gratified in hearing him advocate. Almost in the same breath in which he speaks so feelingly of the happy influences of the reverence felt for the blessed mother of the Lord, we hear him asserting that the honor paid by the Catholics to the Virgin Mary, "must surely be called *adoration*." And again: "We live in an age when tendencies ripen rapidly, and the effects of a quickened belief in, and service of the Virgin of the Assumption, and of all that is therewith connected, would speedily display themselves in a corruption of Catholic doctrine, perhaps worse than what has been hitherto," &c. So much for Protestant consistency! of which, among many more, take a still more startling example. Mr. Faber is in no wise backward in making many and very strong admissions. In speaking of the principle of unity embodied in the Popedom, he uses this language; "a deep feeling oppresses me when I reflect on the history of the Papacy. One while, the idea elevates me by its greatness; at another, it dejects me by its boldness. It is really an awful page in the history of man; and the lower we stoop to decipher the mysterious characters in which it is written, the more manifestly do they appear divine." He reverences Rome, and Rome's primacy, because of that reverential instinct which he finds in the writers of antiquity, and "by no means denies that there was a *divine sanction for it*." He regards Rome as the centre "from which most of Europe was Christianized, and held together in union after it was made Christian." He deplores the separation of Greece from Rome, as "an inauspicious blight on the venerable Churches of the east," and

rejects the idea that the emancipation of any national Church from the subjection to Rome, has conferred upon it a "nobler individuality;" even now he regards Rome as the legitimate capital of Christendom. He admits that even in these days the Papacy is "a captivating idea, for it seems a shorter road to unity than any other;" his foreign sympathies rest mainly with the Latin Church, and "he dares not say and will not think that the office of Rome is over."

Nor are his admissions in regard to his own Church of England, as coming from the mouth of the mysterious stranger, less remarkable than the above.

"You put forward," said he, "the highest possible claims for your Church, often in a tone of pharisaical self-conceit, as though the usages and belief of the greater part of Christendom were of no account whatever in your eyes; you repeatedly indulge in a very offensive sort of commiseration of Rome, forgetting, on the one hand, that you are very young,* and, on the other, Rome's communion is far more extensive, and comprehends wisdom and holiness which must demand the respect of every modest and thoughtful man. And yet, while you talk so largely of your own Church, you put no faith in her. This it is which angers me. It is a kind of hypocrisy. You do not believe that she dare loosen the pegs of her tent cords, in order to enlarge it, lest a rough wind should blow it over in the meanwhile. This is a very bad sign indeed. For, remember, there are many suspicious characteristics which lead foreigners to think that your Church is only a Church upon paper. You are not a fasting Church; yet every other Church in the world has been so from the earliest times. Your clergy as a body do not own their apostolical lineage as essential to the construction of a Church and the administration of the sacraments. Your Church cannot excommunicate, and shrinks very uncharitably from anathematizing heresy. Your people do not believe that infants are actually regenerated by baptism. The commemorations of the departed are disused, and that too *since* your Reformation. Your clergy venture upon the liberty of marriage without respecting the example of all the other western Churches. The glory of the sacrifice of the altar is clouded among you, which must lead in the end to a clouding of the sacrifice of the cross. You do not honor tradition, which must, in the end, lead to a dishonoring of Scripture. Am I then to believe what I have been told on many sides, that your Church is but a dream and your churchmen dreamers, with an unrealized theology, not a branch of the Catholic vine, true, healthy, strong, vigorous, growing, gifted, tangible, substantial? Ah! have you not, perchance, made an illuminated transparency, a soothing sight for quiet times, and sat before it so long and so complacently that you now venture to call it a Catholic Church?"

Now, if the Church of England be such as she is here represented, would not a conscientious man, one enlightened beyond his brethren, be solicitous to come out of her, and unite himself to a Church recognized as possessing all the requisites, the absence of which is deplored in his own? But how stands the case with Mr. Faber? We will allow him to explain himself in his own words, as conveyed in a warning voice through the lips of his mysterious monitor.

"The apostle teaches us that where God finds us, where his grace comes to us, there we should remain, not seeking to be freed even from a position disadvantageous, as we deem it, to our religious advancement. You find yourself in a Church, not surely by accident, but by God's providence, what warrant have you for leaving that Church? Who can authorize you to go away? Is private judgment your ruler? I trust you have not so learned Christ. The presumption,—a presumption sufficiently strong to act upon, is always in favor of the circumstances in which you actually find yourself. So long as you do not believe that your Church is absolutely apostate and unchurched, her candlestick utterly removed, it is your duty to abide in her, your allegiance is due to her, and you cannot be free

* "Vous n'etiez pas hier, vous-autres," was the energetic expression of Bossuet to the minister Claude.

from it without schism and rebellion. You are a member of a Church; explain to me on Church principles, and from the precedents of Church history, what and where the door is, by which you have the power to leave her, and who is to open it for you. Let your regrets be ever so vehement, your disapproval be ever so strong, men's calumny or persecution ever so hard to bear, your own doubts ever so harassing, foreign claims ever so unanswerable, so long as there remains in your mind a conviction that it is *probable* or *possible* for your Church to be really a true branch of the Church universal, I am unable to see what can warrant you in leaving it. O beware! beware!"

We have given the reader the whole of the above curious passage as a specimen of the singular logic which a mind in the state of transition, and not fully aware of the consequences of its own principles, will venture to construct for itself. These and other blemishes, however, we could be content to overlook in consideration of such glowing passages as the following. It is a noble outburst of enthusiastic feeling which will be caught up by every bosom alive to the extraordinary religious aspect of things in the mother land.

"Nay," said the stranger, "Rome has no cause to fear truth; she will gain by it in the end. Behold," continued he, raising his voice, while his face kindled with solemn enthusiasm, "behold, all hearts are turned towards Rome, all eyes fixed upon her in love, hope, fear, and inquiry. Long has her mysterious character been seen, in that men would not feel indifference towards her, as towards a common city, but either fond love or bitter hatred has been her portion from every one who cared for the cross at all. The contracted limits and narrow sympathies of national Churches are again being destroyed. Gallicanism, that vile, unworthy, and disloyal child of the selfish Sorbonne, is now scattered for ever to the four winds of heaven; and the fresh waters imprisoned by the salt sea in your own little island, are bursting down these barriers with a sound to which all Europe listens. Oh, the beauty of old Catholic England! Oh, by the memory of the old Saxon saints! I implore you as a priest consecrating in the shrines of Augustin and of Anselm, to seek daily, to feel and realize, and lean upon the Church Catholic through and beyond your own national branch; throw yourself with a bold meekness into the capacious sympathies and magnificent affections of the Church universal: hide yourself in the mighty beatings of her universal heart. Are there none to set you an example—none whose meek humility and love of discipline can correct the vehemence and untutored zeal which tempts those who walk in a new path?" "Oh yes!" I replied, "there are lowly-minded men even in proud England, whose leaning on the Church Catholic is as bold and trustful as your own; we have men still who walk in our cloisters, singing of the king's daughter, and extolling her golden vessels. Nay, on this Asiatic shore, forgive me if I would leave behind an echo of noble English song—a melody of one who sits uncomplaining by the waters of our Babylon, even thankful for the thin shade of the willows in that thirsty land, and speaking these glorious things of the city of our God:

"'Throughout the older world, story and rite,
Throughout the new, skirting all clouds with gold,
Through rise and fall, and destinies manifold
Of pagan empires, through the dreams and night
Of nature, and the darkness and the light,
Still young in hope, in disappointment old,
Through mists which fallen humanity unfold,
Into the vast and viewless infinite,
Rises the eternal city of our God.
Her towers the morn, with disenchanting rod,
Divinely and darkly labors to disclose,
Lifting the outskirts of th' o'ermantling gloom;
Bright shapes come forth, arch, pinnacle, and dome:
In heaven is hid its height and deep repose.'"

"Is this, indeed," said he, "a modern English strain? In truth it is such an image of the eternal city, as would rise to the keen vision of Austin, as he paced the Mediterranean sands, or the broad eye of Basil amid the rugged scenery of Pontus. I trust such sweetness may win many among you from a narrow-hearted idolatry of a national Church, for most deep and true, most solemn and tender, is their love for their own Church, who gaze from the

steeples of her streets upon the palaces and glittering pinnacles around her; and in the centre of that city, like to a most gorgeous citadel, stands the form of old Rome. See, after long neglect, how all the children of the earth, one after another, even those who are not called by her name, rise up and uncover themselves in her princely presence! See! how the whole world burns to fling itself, in one spontaneous wave of pilgrimage, upon the capital."

Mr. Faber closes his volume with a supposed dream on board the vessel which was bearing him towards Constantinople. It shadows forth the writer's feelings and views, in reference to the present religious position of his country.

"After midnight I fell asleep and dreamed. Methought I was with the mysterious stranger on a bright sunny bank of velvet turf; a little brook murmuring near, and a copse hard by, full of meadow-sweets, the odor of which filled all the air. Every thing around spoke the voluptuous languor of midsummer. The stranger asked me to explain all the doctrines and customs of my Church. So I took a sheet of vellum and I wrote them all out in columns in a fair hand, from the calendars and rubrics of the service books. He was much pleased with it, and said it was very beautiful and good. Then he proposed we should walk up the stream some little way. So I hid the vellum among the meadow-sweets, and we walked together up the stream. But a heavy shower of rain came on, and we took shelter in a cave which was in the face of the rock, all clasped with ivy, bind-weed, and eglantine. When the sun shone again, we returned to our bank and I looked for the vellum, and the rain had washed all the characters away. Upon this the stranger said I had deceived him; that if what I had written were true, no rain would have washed it away; and he would not believe me when I said it was true: but he was very angry. However, he said he would judge for himself. So we rose up, and went a long way for many weeks, till we came to Canterbury on advent Sunday. From thence we went all over the land, throughout the parishes, and the stranger took strict note of all he saw and heard. At length we came to the banks of the Tweed. The stranger would not cross over, but he lifted up his hands and blessed the land on the other side. So we turned back again towards the south, and on Ascension day we were in a forlorn and desolate chancel belonging to a spacious church. It was a dreary, unadorned place, for the beauty was lavished on the nave rather than the chancel, and over the altar, a very mournful symbol, were seven empty white-washed niches. The stranger regarded me with indignation, but did not speak. When he came out of the church he turned to me and said in a solemn voice, somewhat tremulous from deep emotion, 'You have led me through a land of closed churches and hushed bells, of unlighted altars and unstoled priests: Is ENGLAND BENEATH AN INTERDICT?'"

---

## THE COLONIZATION OF MARYLAND.

*An Oration delivered at the second commemoration of the Pilgrims of Maryland, at Philadelphia, May* 10, 1843. By Wm. Geo. Read, LL. D. Philadelphia: M. Fithian.

A YEAR has just elapsed since Mr. Read, standing on the time-honored site of old St. Mary's city, and surrounded by thousands of his fellow-citizens, who had come together to commemorate the colonization of the state, poured forth, under the open canopy of heaven, a strain of impassioned eloquence on that too long neglected topic, and portrayed with master pencil, the enrapturing beauty of the principles and virtues, which adorned the character of Maryland's illustrious founder. Whoever peruses the address delivered in Philadelphia, will

discover that in treating the subject a second time, Mr. Read had lost nothing of the inspiration which distinguished his first production on the hallowed soil of our forefathers. The discourse before us may be truly styled a literary gem, sparkling at every point with the rays of lofty genius, the more surpassing in their brilliancy as they gush forth in unceasing connection with a light from "the Orient on high," the pole-star of religious truth. With no less beauty than originality of idea, the author introduces the principal facts which he narrates, with scriptural associations, which enhance in a high degree the interest of his subject, and although he touches upon few historical incidents, the relation is accompanied with all that wisdom of reflection and ornament of style, which are calculated to insure a most instructive and most delightful perusal. After an appropriate introduction in which he alludes to the hospitality of the city of brotherly love, he thus enters upon his topic:

"We celebrate, indeed, the very festival of hospitality; for we are convened in commemoration of the origin of a state, whose founders, received themselves as brothers by the kindly savage, threw open their doors in turn to the friendless wanderer asking no title to their offices of love, but the common fraternity of sorrow.

"Our anniversary, it is true, is of arbitrary adoption, originally selected for the convenience of a pilgrimage to the long deserted site of the first settlement of Maryland. But it seems to have been chosen well; at a season when the rigors and desolation of winter are forgotten in the vernal burst of universal joy; when the sunny air is vocal with music, when animal and vegetable life teem with renovated energies; and the voice of a God of love, whispering in

> 'The sweet south,
> That breathes upon the banks of violets,
> Stealing and giving odor,'

diffuses fresh hopes throughout creation. And was not this a proper season, to celebrate that glorious spring-time in the human heart, whose beauties, first bursting into being on the sacred soil of old St. Mary's, gave promise that the blighting blast of religious intolerance, that so long had 'frozen' up 'the genial currents of the soul,' had sunk with flagging wing to his boreal caves forever? It was chosen well! in this blessed 'month of Mary,' which the tasteful genius of Christianity, arranging the circling year into one graceful and majestic drama of the everlasting scheme of salvation, has consecrated to especial meditation on the gentle virtues of her, in whose bosom, and upon whose bosom 'the begotten from all eternity' first felt the tender throb of earthly affection! and such was a proper season to commemorate the unexampled decree by temporal power, that man should no longer measure his love to God, by the intensity of hatred for his brother!

"But whatever fanciful circumstances we may cast around their memory, the incidents of Maryland's first existence derive no lustre from them. Radiant with their own light, too clear and bright for the illusions or decorations of fiction, there they shine forever, through the dark history of human perversity—like the fixed stars unchanging from season to season—sparks of the divinity that illumes and warms the universe!

"Is this the language of exaggeration? Unroll your maps, and detail to me the origin of the various communities that have occupied our globe. How many can you show me whose beginning was not stained by violence or fraud? I speak not of those oriental despotisms, whose only authentic history is written in the desolation left by their marching millions, or on those stupendous monuments of pride, that only tyranny could plan, or slavery's overstrained sinews execute. But can you find one among the pirates and robbers of early Greece, whose dazzling genius blinds us to their faults, as to spots upon the sun? Can you find one among the eastern and northern barbarians, who came down on the everlasting city as 'the scourge of God,' or the ruthless conquerors who ravaged in succession our maternal isles! Alas! 'the trail of the serpent is over,' the fairest earthly scenes, and would you behold a nation founded on faith, and hope, and charity,

you must seek it among the planters of Maryland, and the few that have been directed by their principles, or have followed their example.

"It was early in March, 1634, when two vessels entered the majestic 'river of the Swans.'* Above them waved the red cross flag, that 'for a thousand years has braved the battle and the storm.' They bore a band of exiles, who had left their native shores in search of unmolested altars beneath our western trees. Groaning under a worse than Egyptian bondage, they had sought, like the children of Israel, to go into the wilderness to sacrifice to the God of their fathers. And they had obtained permission; for 'the Lord had seen the affliction of his people and had heard their cry: and knowing their sorrow, had come down to deliver them out of the hands of their oppressors; and to bring them out of that land into a good and spacious land, a land flowing with milk and honey.'†

"So too their deliverance came through one who had been familiar in the halls of the king. George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, on whose 'considerate brows,' the statesman's oak, and warrior's laurel, wreathe in graceful harmony with the bays and the passion flower—a man

> 'In a dark age against example good,
> Against allurement, custom and a world
> Offended, fearless of reproach, or scorn,
> Or violence,'

had stopped short, in a political career of transcendent brilliancy, to meditate on the awful concerns of futurity, and renounced at the hazard of every earthly interest, the dominant creed in which he had been educated, for the proscribed communion of the ancient Church. But so little of the zealot was blended with his deliberate action, and such sweet consideration for the supposed errors or weakness of others tempered his uncompromising conscientiousness, that he enjoyed the rare felicity of retaining the regard of his separated brethren, and their testimony to the sincerity of a course which might have seemed to cast censure on their own."

This great man, however, was not destined by divine Providence to carry into effect the benevolent scheme which he had projected. The execution of it was reserved for his sons Cecilius and Leonard. Mr. Read, speaking of the preparations for the expedition across the Atlantic, and its success, indulges in the following just and striking observations:

"Four persons were induced to attend the expedition whose names would be synonymous to many who know them not, with all of evil that malevolence can feign, or ignorant credulity believe; but to such as delight in realities and not in fables, expressive of the devoted charity, the unwearied patience, the graceful courtesy, the ripe erudition, the enlightened faith and fervent piety, the heroic daring, and indefatigable perseverance, that are bound up in the hearts of the Jesuit fathers—men who have already executed—while others are consulting how to begin; who thrust in the sickle—while others are deliberating where to plant; and who, regardless of every thing but the great end to which they have devoted their existence, are as ready to water with their blood the precious seeds of religion and virtue, as to preside over the rejoicings of the harvest-home.

"There was joy and sadness in the 'rich conceit' that named their little squadron the Ark and the Dove! It told of their escape from the wreck of a glorious world, wasted by a moral deluge, that had swept away life and fortune, and the jewelled ties of kindred, and the escutcheons of ancient honor, and the boundless accumulations of by-gone charity, and the beautiful creations of inimitable art, and the land-marks of old opinion and prescriptive right. But it told too of a new country, beyond the waves, still fresh and green from the great primæval inundation, where they should 'increase and multiply and fill the earth,' transmitting the traditions of the olden time to the countless generations that should swarm on the prolific bosom of that renovated world! and it spoke of peace to the simple savage, who as yet had only learned to dread and detest the white man, and was to be reclaimed and

* The meaning of the Indian name Patowomeke. See the "Maid of the Doe," Canto iv. § 22.
† Exodus iii, 7, 8.

christianized by examples of justice, of self-denial, and of love.

"The first trials of their pilgrimage were over. They had escaped the 'perils from robbers, the perils from their own countrymen, the perils in the sea,' and their new home swelled up before their longing eyes, in its illimitable extent and alluring verdure! How did they take possession? Were they 'mad for land?' As the half-clad natives clustered on every jutting point and 'coigne of vantage,' to gaze alarmed and wondering at the portentous spectacle, did our exiles rush on them with the murderous enginery of European war? Did they butcher their braves, insult their women, burn their wigwams, and seize or spoil their corn? Such was the greeting for which previous experience had prepared these hapless children of the wild! And, therefore, did they light in haste their beacon fires, and hurry to the shore with their weak artillery, if possibly the courage of despair might yet avail against the terrible warriors of the winged canoes from the sea!

"But different scenes awaited them. For as Noe descending with his family from the ark, 'built an altar unto the Lord, and taking of all cattle and fowls that were clean, offered holocausts upon the altar,' so these wanderers for Christ sanctified their landing with that 'unbloody sacrifice' prefigured by Melchisedech, foretold by Malachias, and by which the Saviour of the world had commanded his Apostles to 'shew forth' the tremendous expiation on Calvary, till his second coming! Great indeed must have been their 'awful joy!' What though England's plundered and mutilated temples no longer threw their sculptured glories around them, nor ranged choirs responsive to pealing organ intoned the sacred songs? What though their knees were on the sod, and their foreheads bared to the blast? They felt that they were free! free as the wind that waved the lights upon their rustic altar, and swept away the clouding of their incense! No human law proclaimed it treason here, to obey what they believed the behests of an eternal king! Here they might approach that 'living bread,' which 'he that eateth shall live forever,' nor shrink, with nature's instinctive shudder, lest some Judas might be kneeling beside them, who had bargained for their blood with the torturer. Toil and privation were before them, but sweetened by the certainty that their fruit should not be snatched away, for the support of a worship they disapproved, or to punish their conscientious recusancy. Rude was the shelter where high-born loveliness and delicacy must now repose! but her dove-like slumbers should no more be startled from their balmy nest, by the midnight intrusion of official insolence, and vulgar bigotry, that in the name of Jesus, would tear from her bosom the memorial of his dying love! Yes, they were free! free as the joyful glances they threw to the blue arch above them, and as they bowed down before the 'clean oblation,' that shall be offered 'from the rising to the going down of the sun,' their grateful prayers ascended, like the 'sweet savor' of the patriarchal victims, and 'the lifting up of their hands,' was 'as the evening sacrifice.'

"But was there no homage to the spirit of the world? No becoming burst of national pride? No salutary manifestation of superior power? No planting of England's haughty banner amid the '*salvo shots*' of her cannon, and the shouts of her hardy tars? Alas for men, to whose simplicity the 'vain pomp and glory' of this transitory state were not all in all! It was the anniversary of that happy day, when Gabriel announced to the loveliest and lowliest of the daughters of Eve, that she was 'blessed among women;' for that

> The holy 'Spirit that doth prefer
> Before all temples th' upright heart and pure,
> . . . . . who from the first
> Was present, and with mighty wings outspread,
> Dove-like, sat brooding on the vast abyss,
> And made it pregnant,'

should overshadow her! and from her virgin flesh, 'the Son of the Most High' 'put on his' earthly 'beauty.' And in the true spirit of the festival, these messengers of salvation to a benighted land, instead of the ensigns of temporal dominion, set up 'the sign of the Son of man,' and reverently kneeling recited 'the litanies of the Holy Cross!'"

With the same graphic pen does our author describe the high-toned justice and benevolence, that swayed the conduct of the European settlers—the wise legislation that protected the rights of the aborigines—the fraternal spirit which united them with the colonists, and which illustrated in the intercourse of Calvert with the red men, the prophetic exclamation "Mercy and truth are met together: justice and peace have kissed." An example of such virtue had never before been witnessed in the new world; and it easily prepared the way for the peaceful conversion of the untutored savage.

"Yes! they stretched forth a strong hand to their weak brethren of the waste; but, whether it were to cherish or restrain, it was ever in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. For the spirit of their Exodus did not evaporate with their own arrival at the land of promise. They could truly say, in the inspired language of the Roman poet,—'we are men! nothing which affects mankind but is our concern.' And no sooner had they acquired religious freedom for themselves, than their zeal overflowed for the salvation of the red man. You may see the early history of New England illustrated, in your children's school books, by the picture of a soldier standing guard at the door of the meeting-house, over the stacked arms of his fellow-worshippers within. The annals of Maryland display the warriors of the east and west kneeling in peace together around the glad altars of their common God. There is nothing fuller of exciting interest, to one who loves 'the beauty of his house,' than the unaffected details of the first missionaries of Maryland, gathered from the archives of the Society of Jesus at Rome. They breathe the fervor of that eventful day, when the heart-stricken converts of Jerusalem exclaimed 'to Peter and the rest,' 'what shall we do, men and brethren?' They carry us back to that scarce less interesting era, when Ireland's great apostle enlisted, from the fierce warriors of Tara, the first of that glorious army of saints and martyrs, who through ages have triumphed over every hideous device of tyranny exerted for the subversion of their faith, and borne their victorious standard, side by side with England's blood-stained banner, to every region of the habitable globe, which like all-conquering pagan Rome, she is but preparing for the eventual dominion of the cross.

"In those artless manuscripts, you may almost hear the murmured complaints of the ardent fathers to their general, against the timid caution of the rulers of the province, which kept them back from their dangerous labors of love, while the intrigues of Clayborne had excited the natives to momentary jealousy.

"You may follow them, at a later period through toilsome and perilous expeditions, when often, like their Master, they had 'not where to lay their head,' save beneath the canopy of heaven, and their choicest 'meat like his, was to do the will of Him that sent them, that they might perfect his work.' They waited not for the march of armies to 'make straight the way of the Lord.' They loitered not under the shelter of the cannon, till the progress of civilization should prepare the heathen for the secure appeals of the press. Themselves were pioneers of improvement—like the bee that gathers her honeyed harvest of the wilderness, in advance of the white man. They preached the awful mysteries of Calvary with the crucifix. They told the wondrous story of God's dealings with man by sacred pictures. They spoke from heart to heart, the universal dialect of kindly looks and actions. They proved their doctrine by the unanswerable argument of their own disinterestedness and mortification.

"Brief, alas! was the term of their unrestricted labors; but while it lasted the Land of Mary renewed those blissful scenes which, for eighteen centuries, have every where illustrated the fidelity of those whom the Master sends into his vineyard. Fainting with the heats, and often called to weep over some beloved associate, who had sunk under the burthen of the day, they had their consolation when princes and people embraced the Christian name, and attested their spiritual regeneration, by their altered lives. May I detain you, for a moment, with the conversion of Chilomachen, the

Tayac or emperor of Piscataway? Long had the generous barbarian sighed for heavenly truth. Dreams had foreshadowed to himself and his predecessor, the advent of the heralds of the cross. He welcomes at last the long looked-for Father White, lends a docile ear to his gentle admonitions, renounces his previous excesses, and contented with a single wife, devotes himself to the science of salvation. It is easy to the willing mind. He convenes his people; avows his belief in the God of the strangers; abjures the errors of his education, and tramples the objects of his former idolatry. They listen with approving murmurs, and every pulse beats quick with anxious expectation. But he must see Christianity under a more endearing aspect, ere his heart may bound to her maternal embrace. He visits the capital of the province, and finds there an Indian murderer condemned to die. The wretched victim of a harsh but necessary policy, sits gloomy in his prison, meditating the death-song, which shall soon nerve and manifest the stern energies of his soul, amid the horrors of the last dread struggle! But the priest is kneeling beside him, with the tear of earthly pity and the balm of eternal hope. The royal catechumen beholds, with raptured admiration, this new development of the human heart —the love of enemies! He catches the soft contagion—volunteers to interpret with the culprit—and adds the suggestions of his own strong sense to those of the clergyman. Their appeal is not in vain. The prisoner 'departs in peace,' a penitent Christian, expiating his crime against society, with humble trust in the forgiveness of his Maker.

"Chilomachen hesitates no longer. He burns to lave his anxious brow in the cooling well-spring of life. But already he begins to feel the self-denying influences of that law of love, whose 'sweet yoke' he is so eager to bear. He is willing, like the apostle, to be separated, yet a little while from Christ, 'for his brethren according to the flesh.' A chapel, where he may receive baptism with the most impressive solemnity, is erected by his command, at his little capital of Kittamagundi; and savage art exhausts its simple resources, to deck its barken walls with appropriate splendor. The spoils of the panther, the beaver, and the deer, supply the velvet drapery and cloth of gold of Europe's proud cathedrals. The bird's bright plumage and the rich bloom of the wild-flower compensate for the painter's glowing tints, and the delicate foliage of the sculptor. Governor Calvert arrives with a retinue of honor; and there, while the swarthy multitude bend their dark eyes, in eager curiosity, on the mystic ceremonial, the chief and his partner, with their infant offspring, approach the regenerating fount, receiving next that sacramental bond, by whose holy tie the Saviour himself has figured his own union with his elect, in the embrace of eternal love! Again are exhibited the joyous solemnities of the first landing at St. Clement's, but no longer expressive of the white man's unshared hope, for savage and citizen unite in fraternal exultation around the sacred emblem of the sacrifice for all.

"Such were the triumphs of the cross in Maryland; yet to many of us, 'tis pity! they sound as strange as some half-accredited tale from a far distant land.

"While the fame of Pocahontas brightens on our grateful hearts, from century to century, who tells of the generous docility of Archihu, the confiding hospitality of the Werowance of Patuxent, or the miraculous restoration of the speared Anacostian?* Well may poetry and eloquence weave their fairest chaplets for the sweet child of Powhattan; proud may they justly be whose veins can boast a tinge of the rich red blood she freely perilled for the preservation of Smith and of Jamestown; but ought we to forget that she was brought by kidnappers to the saving rite commemorated on the walls of the capital, while the royal progeny of the Maryland forest were freely sent to St. Mary's, to learn their catechism—'that alphabet of divine philosophy.'

"Yes! my hearers, the partial sculpture of our national halls, false as Grecian fable

* The sudden restoration of this man, who had been transpierced with a spear, from side to side, about a hand's breadth below the armpits, on his being touched by the relics of the true cross is told in the manuscript alluded to in the text.

without her redeeming inspiration, displays the storm-tossed Puritans, at the rock of Plymouth, exchanging tokens of amity with the friendly savage, whom 'their' own 'early records incontestably prove them to have attacked without provocation!'* though the horrid truth is told, in Boon's death-grapple, which emblems the planting of the west! But why has the pacific, the *Christian* settlement of Maryland no memorial there, but a simple bust of Calvert?"

The reproof here administered to our officials is the more merited, as the early settlers of Maryland exhibited the first and brighest example, not only of peaceful overture for the civilization of the natives, but of that political and religious liberty which is the birth-right and glory of the American citizen. The concluding portion of Mr. Read's address on this subject, which we transcribe at length, should be a daily reading lesson for sire and son throughout our land, particularly in these boisterous times of fanaticism and immorality.

"Yet deeply as humanity is indebted to the founders of that time-honored community, in respect of that endearing interest the injured Aborigines of America, it might almost be doubted whether, on the still vaster concern of civil liberty, she is not more so. Next in importance to the vital question, 'what shall we do to be saved,' are those which regard the organization of society during our earthly sojourn. Long on these has despairing philosophy argued against fact. Long have the irrepressible energies of nature struggled upward against prescriptive oppression, like undying vegetation bursting into light and air, through the marbled courts of kings. The flaring torch-light of Greek and Roman liberty had indeed gone out in the tempest of faction, but the cheering ray of San Marino's little lamp still streamed from her mountain cross, through the night of ages, a pole star of hope and freedom; and when at last this vast continent was thrown open to man, as a field where, unincumbered with the forms of old establishments, he might try, perhaps, his last great experiment of self-government, many a broken heart poured forth toward heaven its agonizing orisons for his success!

"Vain were it to deny that in the judgment of many, it has lamentably failed. For one, I still hope in the recuperative energy of principle over selfishness; for what but selfishness running riot under systems of morality, in which each individual is his own law-giver and judge, is the source of corporate plunder, official defalcation, public and private bankruptcy, rampant violence, and the time-serving cowardice that shrinks from the maintenance of political faith and the enforcement of social order?

"Let them who, disheartened by our recent disgraceful experience, are tempted to renounce their trust in republican institutions, go in spirit with me to the old state-house at St. Mary's, and learn there the true nature of democracy—the only democracy to be trusted or desired—the collective wisdom and virtue of a religious people. They will find there every freeman of the province present in person or by proxy—'cavilling on the ninth part of a hair,' where his chartered rights are touched, but true to his reciprocal obligations as if he were surrounded by armies and police. He respects prerogative—he resists its encroachments. He pays his quit-rents—he pays his taxes—he watches with dragon vigilance the proprietary's application of appropriations for public service; and he is prodigal, in substantial testimonials of gratitude, 'for his lordship's great charge and solicitude in maintaining the government, and protecting the inhabitants in their persons, rights, and liberties,'*

"No human institution, my friends, however skilfully constructed, can stand by its own strength, and he who blindly resolves his whole political faith into 'the voice of the people,' will soon find himself as insecure in person and in property as the victim of the courtly doctrine of 'divine right.' 'Fear God: honor the King!' On those inspired precepts hangs all the statesman's law. And while the latter must be understood to comprehend whatever form of magistracy the national sovereignty may, for the time, put on, it is only by adhering

* Grimshaw's History United States, page 47.

* Act of 1611, ch. 5.

with fidelity, like the planters of Maryland, to those unchangeable institutions to which we are referred by the former, that we can preserve individual ability to surmount those temptations, whose general predominance is but another name for national degradation.

"But how shall I approach that last great argument, which immortalizes them whom we come here to honor, compared with which their other merits fade from view like the starry host of heaven paled by the glance of day? Monuments and festivals, and laurelled wreaths, and every demonstration of their country's love and gratitude, to the Washingtons, the Wallaces, the Tells, the Bolivars, who broke the chains of political thraldom! But 'glory to God in the highest,' and praise, and blessing, and adoration, and thanksgiving, for the grace that breathed his peace into these 'men of good will,' who gently loosed the fetters of the soul, and measurably restored His honor, whose acceptable worship can only be the voluntary homage of the understanding and the heart!

"Who and what were these unexampled people, who would suffer no believer in Jesus to be molested on account of his religion; who opened their homes and their hearts alike to the victim of Puritan persecution and the Puritan martyr; tolerating, beneath their halcyon rule, every thing but what was then universally considered unquestionable blasphemy and 'railing for railing?'

"Were they philosophers of that easy school, which masks its own indifference or hostility to God's eternal truth, by affected liberality towards every opinion of the hour? Let the world produce examples of men who had proved, by sterner tests, their unyielding tenacity to conscientious convictions! Nay rather, (advanced as they were, before their cotemporaries, in that confidence in truth which never doubts of its peaceful triumph over error) would that they had not somewhat exceeded in their zeal, and, in respect of doctrines whose professors, though scarce amounting to a sect in their day, are now eminent among our separated brethren, for the consistency of their reasoning and purity of their lives, not reached forth the rash hand of flesh to stay the leaning ark of Jehovah, as secure on the necks of the restive oxen, as reposing in 'the holiest place,' under the golden wings of the cherubim!

"Were they fortune's 'happy winners,' who only indulged in a pleasing emotion of our nature, by communicating to others their own satisfaction? Alas! they had been formed by adversity's rudest nurture—

'What sorrow was she bade them know,
And from their own they learned to melt at others' wo!'

Their God-like charity involved not merely pity but forgiveness; but with the thought of their own injuries came back to their hearts the prayer of their dying Saviour—'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!'

"Without a fault, they might have borrowed the caution of other communities, which sought by excluding innovation, to preserve their own tranquillity; while the rest of Christendom went to wreck in the fierce war of opposing doctrine. Had not themselves but just escaped its fury; and might they not, unblamed, have said to their separated brother, like the prudent 'father of the faithful,' 'let there be no quarrel between me and thee! behold, the whole land is before thee!'

"Ought they not then to have foreseen and avoided the cruel consequences which followed so soon their facile hospitality? My friends, the believer looks to principles, not results. He does what conscience dictates, and leaves the rest to God. But had these peaceful rulers, instead of promptly yielding to their generous impulse, set down to a cold calculation of the ultimate effects of their policy, all history had confirmed to them the instinctive teaching of their own true hearts. For what are all these revolutions of temporal power—what all these developments, from age to age, of the varying resources of human ingenuity, and the temporary ascendancy of human will, but so many manifestations by the Most High, to the reflecting mind, of the unchangeable nature of his purposes—'fire, hail, snow, ice, stormy winds which fulfil his word?'

"In this mighty ministry, the planters of

Maryland had their office too. For though their work was not to stand throughout their own brief day, they were to enrich the world with the imperishable monument of their example. Nor can American patriotism devise a holier or more salutary rite, than that in which, on this occasion, I am its unworthy representative. When blind credulity yields to the guidance of ignorance, interest, or prejudice—when once proud Massachusetts waits for the weeping heavens to wash from Mount Benedict the black record of her shame—when manly worth combines with female tenderness, in the name of truth and liberty, to close the hand of pity against the shrinking Catholic orphan; to shut out from the blessed beams of public education the child of the Catholic artisan or laborer, who will not consent to quench in its soul what he deems 'the brightness of the light eternal;' to withhold 'the leave to toil' from the honest Catholic waiter, or the poor Irish girl, whose infantile purity—the emerald crown of her devotion to the 'Queen of virgins'—might sometimes be 'as the lamp shining on the holy candlestick,'* to the giddy foot of fashion's gay votaress whom she sues to serve, unless they will consent to earn 'the meat that perisheth,' by renouncing what they believe 'the living bread which came down from heaven'—then the aching heart can wing its weary way to the peaceful plain of old St. Mary's! There, still, in our land the tired dove can rest upon the olive! There Christians of every creed can still meet in love and harmony like children of the same kind and impartial Father! for there the very air is redolent of the good odor of their lives, as of the fragrance of the sweet wild mint, that wraps the humble graves of *the Pilgrims of Maryland!*"

Sublime peroration, and dazzling with all the power of truth, which we hope will be disseminated far and wide, for the salutary shame and moral guidance of those bigots, who under the pretence of fond attachment for our free institutions, are constantly declaiming against the progress of *Popery*, as if the Catholic had not been their master, their teacher, their exemplar, in the theory and practice of civil and religious liberty, in the new as well as in the old world. Now that these facts are beginning to be better understood, it is marvellous that the members of a *Protestant association* or of a *Reformation society*, do not retreat from their vain design, under the conviction that the light of historic truth, not less than the actual experience of the age, will turn their efforts to their own confusion and defeat. Whatever may be their views of the subject, we consider the position well established that it is too late in the day to proclaim the wisdom of such machinations, and that men who will thus rave against the very principles that are essential for the preservation of their social vitality, are the worst enemies of American freedom, "clouds without water which are carried about by winds: raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion;" whilst by the true philosopher, by the honest legislator, by the practical philanthropist, by the unbiased patriot, the general commemoration of the high principle and unexampled virtue displayed by the pilgrims of Maryland, will be regarded as an era in the history of our liberties, and as one of the most effectual preservatives of our national institutions.

* Ecclesiasticus xxvi, v. 22.

# THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH.

NO. IV.

BOSSUET has well observed that the whole controversy on the subject of the Christian sacrifice, between the Catholic Church and those who are separated from her communion, is reduced to the question of the real presence; for if this point be once admitted, it will easily be conceded that in the eucharist there is a true and real sacrifice, in the sense of the Catholic Church. From the origin of Christianity, *they* only who were deputed to offer sacrifice thus understood, were called *priests;* and we therefore remarked, in preceding articles, that no individual could legitimately assume this title, unless he were empowered to offer sacrifice, and that sacrifice which is taught by the Catholic Church to be the great oblation of the new law, and in which the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly and substantially offered on the altar. We have already shown that Christ instituted a real sacrifice; and it now remains to be proved, in conclusion of this subject, that the victim which is offered on the Christian altar is nothing less than his own sacred body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine. We shall not dwell on the arguments that might be drawn from Holy Scripture, as they have been furnished at length in the first volume of this work. We shall confine ourselves to one principal proof, which will exhibit the positive testimony of the primitive Church in support of our proposition, and which will demonstrate, to the satisfaction of every unbiassed mind, that nothing could be more groundless than the assertion on the part of Protestants, that the Catholic doctrine was introduced at some period, subsequent to the apostolic age.

The universal belief of the Church in the first ages of Christianity, acknowledged that the eucharist contained really and substantially the body and blood of Jesus Christ under the sacramental species. This fact is gathered from the various liturgies which were then in use, and from the writings of the ancient fathers, which attest in the plainest terms, the faith and practice of the primitive Christians.

The liturgy or form of divine worship was not, in the earliest ages, committed to writing. It was retained by memory among the bishops and priests, as the Apostles' Creed was learnt and retained by the faithful. "The symbol of our faith and hope," says St. Jerom, "comes to us from the apostles, and is not written."* But when, in the beginning of the fifth century, there was no longer any danger to be apprehended from the open exposition of the mysteries of religion, the liturgy was placed upon record, and was in substance the same in all Christian countries; a circumstance which shows the unanimous consent of the different Churches on this point, and the belief which had been transmitted to them from primitive times. This is acknowledged even by some of the most distinguished Protestant writers. Archbishop Wake, speaking of the liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James, observes that "the prayers in which they all agree, were first prescribed in the same or like terms by those apostles and evangelists:"† and Bishop Bull upon the same subject, remarks, that "this order of prayer (in the liturgies), was delivered to the several Churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them."‡ In fact the agreement of all the Churches in the east and west, so widely distant from each other, cannot be accounted for in any other hypothesis than the constant and uniform tradition among them of the apostolic teaching. But what is the language of the liturgies?

* St. Jerom ad Pam.
† Apostolic Fathers, p. 102.
‡ Sermons on Common Prayer, vol. 1, serm. 13.

*Liturgy of Jerusalem.**—"Have mercy on us, O God, the Father Almighty, and send thy Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, . . . . that coming he may make this bread the life-giving body, the saving body, the heavenly body, the body giving health to souls and bodies, *the body of our Lord, God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ,* for the remission of sins, and eternal life to those who receive it: Amen. And may make what is mixed in this chalice, the blood of the new testament, the saving blood, the life-giving blood, *the blood of our Lord, God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ,* &c. Amen. Wherefore we offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, for thy holy places which thou hast enlightened by the manifestation of Christ, thy Son," &c.

*Liturgy of Alexandria.*†—"We offer to thee, O Lord, this rational and *unbloody* worship—which all nations, from the rising to the setting sun, from the north to the south, offer to thee, because thy name is great in all nations; and in every place incense is offered to thy holy name, and *sacrifice* and oblation. . . . To thee, O Lord, our God, from thy own gifts we have offered thee what is thine. Send down upon us, and upon this bread and this chalice, thy Holy Spirit, that he may sanctify and consecrate them, as God Almighty; and may make the bread indeed *the body,* and the chalice *the blood of the new testament of the very Lord, and God, and Saviour,* and our Sovereign King, *Jesus Christ,* &c. Supreme Lord, God Almighty! we beseech thee to expel the darkness of sin from our minds, and to exhilarate them with the splendor of thy Holy Spirit, that, filled with a lively sense of thee, we may worthily partake of the good things that are given to us,—the *immaculate body and precious blood* of thy only begotten Son, our Lord, and God, and Saviour," &c.

*Liturgy of Constantinople.*‡—"O Lord, God Almighty, make us worthy to offer thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices; and grant that we may find grace before thee, and that our sacrifice may be acceptable to thee," &c. "Bless, O Lord, the holy bread—Make indeed this bread the *precious body of thy Christ*—Bless, O Lord, the holy chalice; and what is in this chalice, *the precious blood of thy Christ—changing* by the Holy Spirit. Amen, Amen, Amen! That it may be to those who receive it, available to sobriety of soul; to the remission of sins; to the communication of the Holy Spirit; to the plenitude of the kingdom of heaven; to confidence in Thee, not to sin or damnation."

*Apostolic Liturgy.**—"We offer to thee, who art King and God, this bread and this chalice, according to the order of our Saviour. We beseech thee to look down favorably upon these gifts in honor of Jesus Christ, and to send down upon this *sacrifice* thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *he may make this bread become the body of thy Christ, and this chalice his blood.*" At the communion the people exclaim: "Hosanna to the Son of David! blessed be the Lord God, who cometh in the name of the Lord, and has shown himself to us." The rubric adds, "The bishop gives the eucharist with these words: *It is the body of Jesus Christ!* The receiver answers, Amen. The deacon gives the chalice, saying: "*It is the blood of Jesus Christ, the cup of life!* The receiver answers, Amen. And, after the communion, the deacon begins the thanksgiving, saying, "*after having received the precious body and the precious blood of Jesus Christ,* let us give thanks to Him, who has made us partake of his mysteries. The benediction is followed by the *sacrifice*—and after it is offered, each one in order should receive *the body and blood of the Lord,* and approach to it with *the fear and reverence due to the body of the King.*"

*Roman Liturgy.*†—"We beseech thee,

* The most ancient of the liturgies, and commonly used in the Churches of Syria. It is also called the liturgy of St. James.

† Called also the liturgy of St. Mark, who first planted the faith at Alexandria, and who, no doubt, gave a form of prayer or liturgy to his Church. It contains the ancient rite of that Church, and Patriarchate, and was constantly in use among the orthodox Christians in Egypt, till compelled to adopt that of Constantinople.

‡ Called also the liturgy of St. Chrysostom. It is followed by all the Greek Christians in the east and west; by the Russians and nations converted by the Greeks.

* So called, because taken from the eighth book of the "Apostolic Constitutions," a work written in the fourth century; several passages from which are found in St. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæreses.*

† It was the principal liturgy used in the west,

O God, to cause that this oblation may be in all things blessed, admitted, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable; that it *may become for us the body and blood of thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.*" After the consecration, the priest says: "we offer to thy supreme Majesty, of thy gifts and benefits, a *pure host, a holy host, an unspotted host,* the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation." At the communion, bowing down in sentiments of profound *adoration* and humility, and addressing himself to Jesus Christ, then present in his hand, he says thrice: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof, but say only the word and my soul shall be healed." And giving the communion, as in receiving it himself, he declares again, that it is *the body of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Such was the language of the liturgy introduced into the British Isles in 595, and which, up to the sixteenth century was universally celebrated in England, Ireland, and Scotland, as it has been now for many centuries in France, Germany and Spain, and in every country of the world, where Latin priests are to be found.

*Ambrosian Liturgy.**—"Receive, O most merciful Father, this holy bread; that it may *be made the body of thy only begotten Son,* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. Receive, O Holy Trinity, this chalice, wine mixed water, that it may *be made the blood of thy only begotten Son.* In the name of the Father," &c.

*Syriac Liturgy.*†—"May thy holy Spirit come down upon us, and upon these gifts, which we have presented, and may he sanctify them—*and make this bread the glorious body of our Lord Jesus Christ,* the heavenly body, the life-giving body, the precious body, for the expiation of faults, and the remission of sins, and eternal life to those who receive it. Amen. And this chalice, the *precious blood of Jesus Christ,* the Lord God, who has dominion over all things,—the redeeming blood, the life-giving blood, the expiating blood which was poured forth, for the redemption and life of the world, for the expiation of faults, and the remission of sins, and eternal life to those who receive it."

*Liturgy of Nestorius.**—"We offer to thee, this living, holy, acceptable, excellent, and *unbloody sacrifice* for all creatures." "May the grace of the Holy Ghost come and dwell and rest on this oblation, which we are offering before thee; may he sanctify it, and make it, *i. e.* this bread and chalice, *the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: thou transmuting them,* and sanctifying them by the operation of the Holy Ghost, that the receiving of these holy mysteries may avail all who receive them, unto eternal life—may we be worthy, with a pure conscience, to partake of *the body and blood of thy Christ,* &c.—since we have externally received *thy body,* may thy virtue internally dwell in us—Grant that *thy living body, O Lord, which we have eaten, and thy pure blood which we have drunk,* may not turn to our detriment, but to the expiation of our crimes, and the remission of our sins, O Lord of all."

*Coptic Liturgy.*†—"O Lord Jesus Christ, we beg and entreat thy goodness, O Lover of mankind, look down on this bread and on this chalice, which we have placed on this thy sacerdotal table: bless them, sanctify them, and consecrate them: *change them,* so that indeed this bread may become *thy holy body;* and that which is mixed in this chalice, *thy precious blood;* that they may be to us a safeguard," &c.

and was considered to come originally, and in substance from St. Peter. It was inserted by St. Gelasius in his Sacramentary, which was a collection of the prayers said in the course of the mass, in the Church of Rome, from the first ages, to which he added some new prayers and prefaces.

*It was in use at Milan, when St. Ambrose was made bishop of that see in 374; to which he made some additions. The Church of Milan has, to this day, preserved its ancient Ambrosian right, only with a few changes and additions.

† Called the liturgy of St. Basil. We learn from St. Gregory of Nazianzen, that St. Basil composed prayers for the altar; and in his letter to the clergy of Neocesarea, St. Basil speaks of the prayers he had made for the mass. This liturgy is one of the most ancient in use among the Syrians, and in other parts of the east.

* This was the *old liturgy* of the Church of Constantinople, before Nestorius; but in the preface he denies the unity of person in Christ.

† Called also the liturgy of St. Basil, and in use among the Eutychians and Jacobites, in Egypt,—so called from James the Syrian, one of the Eutychian leaders.

*Alexandrian Liturgy.**—"Do not reject us sinners who are offering to Thee, this tremendous and *unbloody sacrifice*." "Grant that with all fear and a pure conscience, we may offer to thee this spiritual and *unbloody sacrifice* on this holy altar." Elevating the larger part of the consecrated host, he says: "Τα ἁγια τοις ἁγιοις—*The holy and precious blood of Jesus Christ*, the Son of God. Amen. The holy, precious body, and true blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Amen. The body and blood of Emanuel, our God, this is truly. Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe and confess, till my last breath, that it is the very life-giving flesh of thy only begotten Son, our Lord, God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ. He took it of our holy lady, mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary."

Some of these extracts are taken from the liturgies or form of public worship used *from the beginning* in the oriental patriarchal Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, and in Churches under their respective jurisdictions. Other extracts are taken from the liturgies used by the different divisions of the Nestorian and Eutychian sects in the east, which retain the full substance of the ancient orthodox liturgies of the Churches in which these sects made their appearance, with the addition of a very few particular sentences, expressive of the Nestorian and Eutychian doctrines. But on the nature of the sacrifice of the mass—on the oblation of the true body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine—on the reception of the same by the faithful in the holy communion—and on the miraculous change of bread and wine into the body and blood of our divine Saviour,—these liturgies of the Nestorians and Eutychians *are as clear and expressive as any of the ancient liturgies of the orthodox Churches.* This language of the Nestorians and Eutychians was not borrowed from the Catholic Churches of Jerusalem, or Alexandria, or Constantinople, *after* the years 431 or 451, when these heretics were separated from the communion of the Church: but it was the liturgical language of the orthodox Churches, with which Nestorius and Eutyches were in communion *before their separation*, and which had used the substance of the same form of public prayer and worship, from the first establishment of Christianity in them.

"It is impossible to read these oriental liturgies, these forms of public worship, embodying the doctrines of faith professed by the Churches in which they were used, and to notice the ancient and universal doctrinal uniformity which they present, in the simplicity of their language; without candidly acknowledging that *the true body and blood of Christ were believed to be really present under the appearances of bread and wine;* and were offered as the Christian *sacrifice*, and received as the holy sacrament of the new law, in those Churches in the east, in which Christianity was first established by the apostles."*

We will now proceed to show that the language of the holy fathers corresponds exactly with the language of the liturgies.

*St. Ignatius.*†—These Gnostic heretics "abstain from the eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated. Rejecting, therefore, this gift of God, they die in their disputes."—*Ep. ad Smyrn. p.* 36. *T.* ii, *pp. Apost. Amstelædami*, 1724.

*St. Justin.*‡—"Our prayers being finished, we embrace one another with the kiss of peace. Then to him who presides over the brethren, is presented bread and wine tempered with water; having received which he gives glory to the Father of all things in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and returns thanks in many prayers that he has been deemed worthy of these gifts. These offices being duly performed, the whole assembly, in acclamation, answers *Amen:* when the ministers whom we call deacons, distribute to each one present a

* Called also the liturgy of St. Basil, taken from the Græco-Arabic.

* Dr. Poynter's Christianity, p. 140.

† He was the disciple of St. John, and suffered martyrdom in the beginning of the second century.

‡ A Christian philosopher, by birth a Greek, who suffered martyrdom at Rome, about the year 166, having, a few years before, addressed two apologies, in favor of the Christians, to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and to the Roman senate.

portion of the blessed bread, and the wine and water: some is also taken to the absent. This food we call the eucharist, of which they alone are allowed to partake who believe the doctrines taught by us, and have been regenerated by water for the remission of sin, and who live as Christ ordained. *Nor do we take these gifts as common bread and common drink;* but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation: in the same manner we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, *is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate.* The apostles, in the commentaries written by them, which are called Gospels, have delivered that Jesus so commanded, when taking bread, having given thanks, he said: *Do this in remembrance of me: This is my body.* In like manner, taking the cup and giving thanks, he said: *This is my blood:* and that he distributed both to them only."—*Apol.* i, *Hagæ Comitum,* 1742, *pp.* 82, 83.

*Origen* (Third century).—"You that have been accustomed to be present at the divine mysteries, know, when *you receive the body of the Lord,* with what care and veneration you preserve it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground, or be lost; and you think yourselves guilty, and with reason, if it should so happen through your negligence." *Hom.* xiii, *in Exod. T.* ii, *p.* 176.

*St. Hippolytus.**—Commenting on the words of Proverbs, ix—*Wisdom hath built herself a house,* he says: "*He* (Christ) *prepared his table,* that is, the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity, and moreover his venerable and sacred body and blood, which are every day offered up in remembrance of that divine and mysterious supper. *Come, eat my bread, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you,* that is, *his divine body and his venerable blood, which he gave us to eat and drink for the remission of sins."*—*In Prov. c.* ix, *p.* 282.

*St. Ephrem of Edessa.*†—"*His body,* by a new method, is mixed with our bodies, and his *most pure blood* is transfused into our veins. *He is wholly incorporated with us.* And because he loved his Church he was made the bread of life, that he might give himself to be eaten."—*Hymn* xxxvii, *de Virginitate, Bibl. Orient. Assemani. T.* i, *p.* 97. "You believe that Christ, the Son of God, for you, was born in the flesh. Then why do you search into what is inscrutable? Doing this you prove your curiosity, not your faith. Believe then and with a firm faith receive the *body and blood of our Lord.* Abraham placed earthly food before the celestial spirits (Gen. xviii), of which they ate. This was wonderful; but what Christ has done for us, greatly exceeds this, and transcends all speech, and all conception. To us that are in the flesh he has given *to eat his body and blood.* Myself incapable of comprehending the mysteries of God, I dare not proceed; and should I attempt it, I should only show my own rashness."—*De Nat. Dei minime scrutanda. T.* iii, *pp.* 423-4.

*St. Cyril of Jerusalem.**—In his instructions addressed to those who had been newly baptised, he says: "The bread and wine, which, before the invocation of the adorable Trinity, were nothing but bread and wine, become, after this invocation, *the body and blood of Christ."—Catech. Mystag.* 1 *n.* vii, *p.* 308. "Jesus Christ in Cana of Galilee, once changed water into wine by his will only; and shall we think him less worthy of credit, when he changes wine into blood? Invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this miracle; and shall we hesitate to confess, that he has given to his children his body to eat, and his blood to drink? Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For in the type or figure of bread, his body is given to thee, and in the type or figure of wine, his blood is given; that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him. Thus, the body and blood of Christ being

* He suffered martyrdom in 230.

† He flourished in the middle of the fourth century. His writings were in such estimation, says St. Jerom, that in many churches they were read after the canonical Scriptures.

* Of his twenty-three Catechetical Discourses, eighteen were addressed to the *uninitiated,* or catechumens, and five to the *initiated,* or newly baptised. He was patriarch of Jerusalem, and died in 386.

distributed in our members, we become *christofori*, that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says, 'we are made partakers of the divine nature.'"—*Ibid. n.* ii, iii, *p.* 320.

*St. Ambrose.**—"But you may say, I see somewhat else; how do you assert, that I shall receive the body of Christ? This remains to be proved. How many examples may we not make use of to show that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature; because by it nature itself is changed? Moses held the rod: he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent. Again he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod. See you not that by the prophetic power, the nature of the rod and the serpent was twice changed?" He proceeds to instance many other miraculous changes, as recorded in Scripture, and then adds: "If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? . . . . Therefore, the word of Christ which could draw out of nothing what was not, shall it not be able to change the things that are, into that which they were not? . . . . . Before the benediction of the celestial words, the bread (*species*) is named; after the consecration the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before consecration it has another name; afterwards it is denominated blood. And you answer *Amen*, that is, it is true."

*St. Augustin.*†—"You ought to understand what you have received, what you are about to receive, and what you ought every day to receive. The bread that you behold on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, *is the body of Christ.* That cup—that which the cup contains—sanctified by the word of God, *is the blood of Christ.* We receive with a faithful heart and mouth the mediator of God and man, the Man, Christ Jesus, who has given us *his body to eat, and his blood to drink;* although it may appear more horrible *to eat the flesh of a man*, than to destroy it, and *to drink human blood*, than to spill it."—*Contra Adv. Legis et Proph. L.* ii, *c.* ix, *T.* viii, *p.* 599. Speaking of his mother's death, he says: "She desired that remembrance of her should be made at the altar: a service which, on no day, she had omitted; knowing that thence was dispensed the holy victim, by which the hand writing against us had been blotted out."—*L.* ix, *Confess. c.* 13, *T.* i, *p.* 170.

These passages which we have adduced, are only a few among the innumerable testimonies of the primitive fathers, in favor of the Catholic doctrine of the eucharist. But they will suffice to show the absurdity of the assertion that this doctrine was introduced only in the ninth or eleventh century. The fact is and it will be obvious to every unprejudiced mind, that the language of the council of Trent itself, is not more distinctly explicit on the subject of the eucharist, than the language of the ancient ecclesiastical writers. "It is incontestible," as Dr. Milner observes, "and has been carried to the highest degree of moral evidence, that all the Christians of all the nations of the world, Greeks as well as Latins, Africans as well as Europeans, except Protestants and a handful of Vaudois peasants, have in all ages believed, and still believe in the real presence and transubstantiation."* No historical fact rests upon stronger grounds than this; the conclusion therefore will be that those individuals who call themselves ministers of the Gospel, while they do not believe in, or offer up the eucharistic sacrifice as understood by the Catholic Church, are not ministers of Christ, or priests of the new law, since they do not possess in any way that worship which constitutes the glory and consolation of the true Christian Church.

* Bishop of Milan for twenty years. He died in 397.

† The illustrious bishop of Hippo, in Africa. He died in 430.

* See Faith of Catholics, and Perpetuite de la Foi.

# THE BOOK OF RATRAMN.

*The book of Ratramn, the priest and monk of Corbey, on the Body and Blood of the Lord; to which is added an Appendix, with a Preface,* by the Right Rev. W. R. Whittingham, D.D. Bishop of Maryland. Baltimore: Robinson, 1843.

IT has been frequently remarked that persons, who are in danger of being drowned, seize with the utmost eagerness upon any support, how frail soever, that is to be found within their reach. The same now appears to be the case with the pastors of certain Protestant societies. Sensible of their daily losses, and of the corresponding spiritual conquests of the Catholic Church, they leave nothing untried to retard her progress; and, being under the impossibility of entirely concealing the light from the eyes of their followers, they endeavor at least to obscure its brilliancy, and to prevent its sacred beams from producing all those effects which might cause their ranks to be entirely deserted.

These reflections have been naturally suggested by the publication in England, and the late republication in America, of a little treatise on the eucharist, written by Ratramn, a monk of the ninth century. The avowed purpose of the publishers is to make people believe that neither Ratramn, nor the Church of his time, admitted the dogma of transubstantiation, and consequently that this dogma is a mere novelty altogether unknown before the ninth century, and introduced into the *Romish* Church at a subsequent period. That such an attempt is utterly impotent, and that not even the slightest inference unfavorable to the Catholic religion, can be drawn from Ratramn's work, will soon be made manifest by a variety of arguments to which we confidently call the attention of an enlightened public. But we deem it expedient to offer a few previous remarks, as well on the preface of Bishop Whittingham, as on that of the English translator, and on his version of Ratramn. This we shall do, freely indeed, as the subject requires, yet without imitating the abusive language of our opponents, which so affectedly appears in the words *Romanist, Romish Church, Romish errors,* &c., being fully satisfied that nicknames, insulting epithets, and groundless charges, ought to be left entirely at the discretion of those who have no better argument and reason to support their cause.

In the first place the authors of both prefaces uselessly spend much time in proving what we readily acknowledge; that Catholic theologians are divided as to the meaning of Ratramn's work; some maintaining and others denying his having taught the doctrine of transubstantiation. As this is a matter of fact and as the individual opinion of Ratramn is unimportant in itself, compared with the mass of evidence which Catholics derive from other sources; it is by no means astonishing that, finding in the same work passages which clearly express, and others which seem to exclude, Transubstantiation, they should be divided among themselves concerning the real sentiment of its author; this proves only that they are neither anxious to consider him as an advocate of their doctrine, nor afraid to acknowledge him as an adversary, and that they attach very little importance to his opinion, whatever it may have been. But what must appear truly surprising, is, that Protestants, who lay so much stress upon it, and whose interest it is to be perfectly unanimous about the reality of their claim, are themselves divided with regard to Ratramn's sentiments; for, whilst his Anglican publishers proclaim him decidedly opposed to the Catholic doctrine, the centuriators of Magdeburg acknowledge on the contrary that he not only admits the real presence, but is even favorable to transubstantiation; because, say they, he makes use of the words *conversion* and *change*; "*utitur enim vocabulis* commutationis *et* conversionis." (*Centur.* ix.)

2. Bishop Whittingham confidently asserts, in the beginning of his preface, that the book of Ratramn is "concise, explicit, *intelligible*, free from scholastic subtleties and mystic refinements," and that "it presents in brief compass a *clear* and consistent view of the doctrine of the real presence of our Lord in his sacrament of the holy eucharist." Now the character of the book is, in general, just the reverse of *intelligibility and clearness*. Otherwise, why should there be such a diversity of opinion among Protestants themselves concerning its true meaning? Why should the author have entertained and expressed a fear of being misunderstood, as the concluding words of his treatise show that he did. "Yet," says he, "let it not be thought, *from my saying this*, that in the mystery of the sacrament, the body and blood of the Lord are not received by the faithful." In fine, why, if the work is *explicit, intelligible, clear*, and *consistent*, did Bishop Whittingham take the useless trouble of guarding his readers against what he calls the "*less carefully worded expressions* of Ratramn," both in affirmation of the real presence, and in denial *of the local presence*, words which are not very *clear* themselves?

3. Still more strange is another assertion of the bishop, which occurs in the first page of his preface. "It is," says he, "mainly as *evidence* as well to the point what *was not*, as what *was* the doctrine then held on the subject of which it treats, that this little book is valuable. Not only does it aid in fixing the precise date of the heretical notion of *transubstantiation*, but it establishes conclusively the fact that it was no part of the view held to be orthodox, not only when and where the author wrote, but for ages afterward." How, we ask, does Ratramn's treatise establish such a fact? how does it show that the dogma of transubstantiation was not admitted then, nor for ages afterward? How can this be the case, if Ratramn himself admits it as a part of the Christian doctrine, if his book was never understood in any other sense before the rise of Protestantism, if there are a thousand other evidences *to establish conclusively* the fact that the Catholic Church, as well in the ninth century as before and after, always believed and taught the real presence and transubstantiation? These points will be soon and easily proved against the bishop, the last especially, which he knows to be the most important of all. Again, if Ratramn's book does not speak of transubstantiation, as the bishop asserts (*Preface, p.* vi), how does it aid in fixing the *precise date* of the notion of that dogma? How can the *negative* argument of silence lead any one to such *a positive and precise* conclusion? These are questions which we leave to the ingenuity of the bishop to solve. As to the charge of *heresy* which he ventures to urge against the belief of transubstantiation, he will do well to prepare himself for his own vindication from this charge, when we take the liberty of presenting him our arguments in favor of the Catholic doctrine.

4. Besides the illogical inferences of the bishop's reasoning, the very simple facts upon which he builds his assertions, are suppositious and groundless. Not only does he take it for granted, without sufficient reason, that Ratramn did not admit transubstantiation,—not only does he suppose against all evidence, that Ratramn, if such was his meaning, received the approbation of his cotemporaries, and that the bishops of his country esteemed and honored him on account of the work which he had written on the eucharist;—there is not a shadow of proof to show that the little treatise possessed any repute among his cotemporaries. Had Bishop Whittingham carefully consulted *the learned Benedictine monks*, whose authority in these matters he so much and so justly values, he would have seen in the learned Benedictine monk D. Ceillier (*Hist. des auteurs eccles. vol.* xix, *p.* 137), that the first known quotation of Ratramn's work is from an anonymous writer, whom critics believe to have been Gerbert, archbishop of Rheims at the close of the tenth century, more than one hundred and twenty years after Ratramn had written. "It does not appear," says the equally celebrated author of *Perpétuité de la Foi*, "that this treatise was published during the reign of Charles the Bald, at whose request it had been composed,

nor even for a long time afterwards. This is acknowledged by a Calvinian professor at Leyden, in these words: "it is probable that the book of Ratramn was not published, because, otherwise, Lanfrancus would not have failed to mention it; *Bertramni scriptum editum non fuisse credibile est, de quo alioquin Lanfrancus non fuisset taciturus.*" (*Perpétuité de la Foi*, 18mo, *pp.* 369, 370, and 4to, *vol.* i, *b.* xii, *p.* 29 *of the Appendix.*) The English author of the second preface, might also have ascertained from these accurate sources, that neither was transubstantiation first propounded by Paschasius Radbertus, nor was the treatise of Ratramn written against this dogma which, on the contrary, he and Paschasius alike admitted with the whole Church; he might have learned from these authorities that the object of Ratramn's book was to discuss a question which was a mere matter of opinion, and which occupied the attention of scholars at that time. The question among them was to know whether, besides the reality of the body and blood of the Lord in the eucharist, there should also be admitted a figure of their actual presence; namely, whether the outward appearances of bread and wine which remain after the consecration, were to be considered as a figure of Christ concealed under them, and as a sort of veil destined to prevent him, though really present, from being perceptible to the senses. It was in reference to this and similar questions that Ratramn composed his treatise, as he himself states, in the first and second paragraphs.

5. We cannot but admire the consistency of Bishop Whittingham, with regard to the Benedictine monks. When he wishes to extol the merit of Ratramn as an author, their opinion being on this point in accordance with his own, "their authority is of the highest and most unquestionable kind." (*Preface, p.* vi.) When the question is to ascertain the real meaning of Ratramn in his book on the eucharist, as their opinion on this subject is widely different from that of the bishop, he sets it aside without the least hesitation (*pp.* vii, viii); as if those persons who are most capable of appreciating an author, had been unable to understand his works, and had lost their judgment in the examination of his sentiments, whilst they are admitted to be *the most unquestionable* vouchers of his literary merit! *Diverse weights and diverse measures,*—such is the policy of Bishop Whittingham in relation to the *learned Benedictine monks of the congregation of St. Maur.*

He does not, however, stop here; he alters their own words, and attributes to them sentiments which they do not avow. According to them, it was King Charles the Bald, a man of no great soundness of judgment, who "chose Ratramn to be his instructor as to what he ought to believe concerning predestination and the eucharist." According to Bishop Whittingham this author was "selected for his ability to enlighten kis king on the subject of the presence of Christ in the eucharist, and so discharged his task in the estimation of the bishops of his country," &c. (*p.* ix), words which would lead the reader to suppose against the truth of history, that Ratramn's performance had been approved by the generality of the French prelates.

Again, the Benedictines affirm, without any superlative degree, but rather with some restriction, "*If the difficulty* of putting a right construction on his treatise on the eucharist, has excited suspicions in the minds of some moderns, concerning his faith as regards that article, *he has had that stain advantageously wiped away,* the last two centuries, by several celebrated theologians" (*Preface, p.* viii); but, according to the comment of the bishop, "it is admitted to be *very difficult* to put a construction compatible with the dogma of transubstantiation." (*p.* 9.) What are we to infer from these nice alterations, than that the gentleman, being conscious of the insecurity of the ground upon which he stands, has recourse to every sort of expedient to render it less insecure, if possible?

6. We are certainly authorised to form the same judgment of the appellation by which Bishop Whittingham affects to designate the Episcopalian Churches, situated on this and on the other side of the Atlantic; calling them *the Catholic Churches in England and America.* When some essen-

tial characteristic or advantage is not possessed by an individual, it may be a consolation for him at least to assume its name; but what a poor consolation, in a matter of so serious a nature as the Church, to assume the name, without having the reality! and who is there knowing that the word *Catholic* means *universal*, that will not smile at the strange idea and attempt of the bishop to apply it to a few Churches, not even united among themselves, of a part only of North America, and of a very small portion of Europe?

7. We shall say nothing more for the present on the prefaces of the two editors of Ratramn's work, as their chief misstatement concerning the meaning of this author, and particularly concerning the doctrine of the Church in his time, will be the subject of subsequent remarks. Before we enter, however, upon these observations, it will be necessary to premise a few words relative to the translation of Ratramn's book, a translation originally made in England, and now presented to the American public by Bishop Whittingham, who confidently proposes it as an *accurate translation*. Whether in thus commending it, and giving it the sanction of his name, he was conscious or ignorant of the many *inaccuracies* which it contains, and if ignorant, whether this disqualification to speak of its merits, was the effect of carelessness, we leave to others to judge. As for us, we have no hesitation in pronouncing the version very unfaithful, and that too on points of very great importance, as may be easily perceived from the following undeniable facts and quotations.

1. Whenever Ratramn, speaking of the eucharistic elements after the consecration, designates them by *speciem visibilem, species*, it is plain, both from the obvious signification of these words, and from the context of his book, that he means the visible form, the color, the shape, and other outward appearances of the bread and wine. That his meaning is no other than this, appears in several passages; *v. g.* in the ninth section, where he says:

"That bread, which by the ministry of the priest, is made the body of Christ, showeth one thing *outwardly* to man's senses, and proclaimeth another thing inwardly to the souls of the faithful. *Outwardly*, the form of bread, which it was before, is presented, its color is exhibited, its taste is perceived; but inwardly, a far different thing is declared (*intimatur*), and that much more precious, much more excellent, for it is heavenly, for it is divine; that is, Christ's body."

Again: "The wine, also, which by the priest's consecration is made the sacrament of Christ's blood, showeth one thing *outwardly*, and inwardly containeth another," etc.

It is, therefore, plain that Ratramn admits only the *outward appearance of bread and wine* to remain in the eucharist after the consecration: yet his translator every where renders the expression *species, visibilem speciem*, by the word *nature*, to make him signify that the nature of bread and wine also remains, and consequently that there is no Transubstantiation.

*Ratramn's Words.*

XVI. Non quod duarum sit existentia rerum inter se diversarum, corporis videlicet et spiritûs, verùm una eademque res secundùm aliud *species* panis et vini consistit, secundùm aliud autem corpus est et sanguis Christi. Secundum namque quod utrumque corporaliter contingitur, *species* sunt creaturæ corporeæ; secundum potentiam verò quod spiritualiter factæ sunt, mysteria sunt corporis et sanguinis Christi.

LVII. Hæc verò caro, quæ nunc similitudinem illius in mysterio continet, non sit *specie* caro, sed sacramento. Si quidem in *specie* panis est; in sacramento, verum Christi corpus, sicut ipse clamat Dominus Jesus, "hoc est corpus meum."

*Words of the Translator.*

XVI. Not that two things co-exist diverse between themselves, namely body and spirit, but one and the same thing hath in one respect *the nature* of bread and wine, in another is the body and blood of Christ. As far as they are corporally handled, they are *in their nature*, corporal creatures, but in their power, as they are spiritually made, they are the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ.

LVII. The flesh, which now in a myste-

ry containeth the similitude of the former, is not flesh *in its nature*, but in a sacrament. For *in its nature* it is bread, but sacramentally it is the true body of Christ, as the Lord Jesus himself declareth, "this is my body."

It is evident that, instead of *in its nature* there ought to be in both places *in its appearance*; otherwise flesh would be no flesh at all; the true body of Christ existing in the sacrament would not be *his true body;* Ratramn would have spoken a most ridiculous language, and Christ himself in saying, "this is my body," would not have spoken the truth. Let the same remark be applied to the same expressions in many other places of the so-called *accurate* translation, *v. g.* the end of numbers x, xii, &c., where *nature* is constantly thrust in for *visible form* or *appearance.*

Another glaring alteration is the turning of *non esse cernuntur* into *evidently are not*, instead of *are not seen to be*, and the addition of the word *substance* to the words of Ratramn, in a place where it is impossible for an attentive and impartial reader not to see that he speaks of the *body* of outward appearances, and exterior qualities of the eucharistic elements.

XV. Si aliud sint quam fuêre, mutationem accepêre. Cùm hoc negari non possit, dicant secundum quid permutata sunt; corporaliter namque nihil eis cernitur esse permutatum. Fatebuntur igitur necesse est, aut mutata esse secundum aliud quàm secundum *corpus*, ac per hoc non esse hoc quod in veritate videntur, sed aliud quod *non esse* secundum propriam essentiam *cernuntur:* aut si hoc profiteri noluerint, compelluntur negari corpus esse sanguinemque Christi, quod nefas est non solùm dicere, sed etiam cogitare.

XV. If they are other than they were before, they have undergone *some* change (it should be *a* change). Since this cannot be denied, let them say in what respect they are changed. For no bodily change (*transeat*) can be seen in them. They must, therefore, confess either that they are changed in respect of something else than their corporal *substance*, and that, therefore, they are not what in truth they seem to be, but somewhat else, which they *evidently are not* in their proper essence; or, if they will not acknowledge this, they are forced to deny that they are the body and blood of Christ, which is impious, not only to say, but even to think.

The preceding paragraph, number xiv, presents another instance of egregious perversion of the sense, the less justifiable in our opinion, as it cannot be excused by any plea of ignorance in the translator. Ratramn speaking of those who were unwilling to admit with him, besides the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, a figure consisting in the remaining appearances of the eucharistic elements, says:

"Quærendum est ergò ab eis qui nihil hìc figuratè volunt accipere, sed totum in veritatis simplicitate consistere, *secundum quod demutatio* facta sit, ut *jam non sint*, quod *antè fuerunt*, videlicet panis atque vinum, sed sint corpus atque sanguis Christi." "*They must be asked . . . in what respect the change* has been made by which *they are no longer* what *they were before*, that is to say, bread and wine, but are the body and blood of Christ."

This passage, as every one will confess, is very strong in favor of the dogma of transubstantiation, nor do Catholics express it in more positive language at the present day. But our English translator of the Book of Ratramn has had the art to make the sentence run thus: "They, therefore, who will take nothing figuratively, but will have the whole matter consist in simple truth, must be asked, in what respect that change takes place, by which the elements *come to be* what *they were not before* (namely bread and wine), but the body and blood of Christ." Very innocent apparently is this slight inversion in the phraseology—a mere transfer of the syllable *not* from one verb to the other! yet it removes, or at least, considerably obscures the idea of transubstantiation, which Ratramn clearly expresses; but this is what the translator wanted.

Such are, among other instances, the notable deficiencies of a translation so confidently presented to the American public as an accurate work. Had we not then reason to insinuate that the approbation and praise bestowed upon it by Bishop Whit-

tingham, might be discreditable to his character or learning? Will not also the many inaccuracies and faults with which it abounds, raise a suspicion in the minds of many that there was *a good reason* not to print the original text of Ratramn side by side with the translation, and that it was found more convenient to insert it at the end of the volume? May we not hope also, that these considerations will lead our dissenting brethren to further reflection, and open their eyes to the religious as well as literary impositions, that are practised upon them?

8. We will now proceed to examine more fully the real doctrine of Ratramn concerning the eucharist; not that we attach any importance to the opinion of that author, but for the sake of historical truth, and to show that his book can be of no real service to our opponents, no matter under what point of view they may choose to consider the subject. We willingly admit that in several sections of the little treatise, there are obscure and singular expressions, for which it was justly disapproved by the Roman censors, and the author's name with reason discarded by the learned and pious Cardinal Bellarmine, from the list of those ecclesiastical writers who have deserved well of the Church. It can, however, be proved, without great difficulty, with Mabillon, Ceillier, Fleury, Natalis Alexander, &c., that the doctrine of Ratramn on the real presence and transubstantiation, although sometimes concealed under abstruse language, is no other than the Catholic doctrine. Among the many passages of his book which sustain us in this assertion, we select the following.

Section IX. "That bread, which by the ministry of the priest is made the body of Christ, showeth one thing outwardly to man's senses, and proclaimeth another thing inwardly to the souls of the faithful."

X. "Likewise the wine, which by the priest's consecration is made the sacrament of Christ's blood, showeth one thing outwardly, and inwardly containeth another."

XII. "How shall that be called the body of Christ, in which no change is known to be made?" We will here make a brief remark, lest the drift of the English translation should lead into error. Ratramn in this passage, and in the two preceding sections, argues from the exterior appearance of the bread not undergoing any change, that it is not, therefore, this exterior appearance which can be called the body of Christ. Consequently he admits that the body of Christ is truly in the eucharist, and that it is there also in virtue of some change, or transubstantiation. "Here," says he, in the same section, "the bread and wine had a real existence, before they passed into the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ."

XIII. "We here detect no change in taste, color, or smell. If then there is no change *here*, it is the same which it was before. But in truth it is somewhat else, since the bread is made the body, and the wine the blood of Christ. Christ himself hath said, 'take eat, this is my body.' Likewise, speaking of the cup, he saith, 'take, drink, this is the blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for you.'"

XV; last lines. "To deny that they are the body and blood of Christ, is impious not only to say, but even to think." And he had said just before; "they, indeed, faithfully confess the body and blood of Christ, and by so doing, without doubt they profess that the elements are not the same thing which they were before; and if they are other than they were before, they have undergone some change."

XLII. "So that the bread which is offered, though taken from the fruits of the earth, is by consecration changed into Christ's body, and the wine, though it hath flowed from the vine, yet by the consecration in this divine mystery is made the blood of Christ, not indeed visibly, but, as this doctor (St. Isidore) saith, by the invisible operation of the Spirit of God."

XLIX. "From all that we have heretofore said, it hath been proved, that the body and blood of Christ, which in the Church *are received by the mouths* of the faithful, are figures *according to the visible form.* But according to *the invisible substance*, that is, the power of the word of God, they are *truly* the body and blood of Christ." &c., &c.

Let Bishop Whittingham discover, if he

can, in these passages, a denial or even a mere omission of the real presence and transubstantiation. Are they not plain enough to show that Ratramn believed and taught, on the subject of the eucharist, exactly the same doctrine that Catholics profess and have always professed? Are we not fully authorized to assert that if, in several other places, where he examines various incidents of this mystery, he used obscure expressions, which *the adherents of the council of Trent* would not be inclined to adopt, even *these* were employed by him in a Catholic sense?* But perhaps the bishop would rather admit that Ratramn, an author of *such standing* and *celebrity*, is perpetually at variance with himself, and that his book so *concise, explicit, intelligible, clear* and *consistent*, is a mere compound, and one continued series of absurd reasonings and contradictions; but in this case, of what advantage can either the book or the author be to the Protestant cause?

If it follows from our arguments and proofs, that the many Protestant editors of Ratramn's treatise must have been wofully mistaken about its meaning, and that "a judicial blindness must have possessed them, to be so active in disseminating a work that taught transubstantiation," (Pref. *p.* 9.) these consequences are of no concern to Catholics. The fault is not ours, if the opponents of Catholicity, through a desire of upholding a groundless system, plunge headlong into insuperable difficulties: let them answer for themselves.

What has been said of Ratramn's book is entirely applicable to the Saxon homily of Ælfric, who, having received his religious education from some monks of Corbey, adopted their peculiarities of language. Yet, whatever may be the obscurity of his style, let the reader judge whether the following sentences (*pp.* 95, 97) would sound well from a Protestant pulpit: "Much is betwixt the invisible might of the holy housel, and the visible shape of his proper nature; it is naturally corruptible bread and corruptible wine; and is, by might of God's word, *truly Christ's body and his blood:* not so, notwithstanding, bodily, but ghostly;" that is, not visibly, but invisibly; otherwise, how would it be *truly Christ's body and blood?*

* For instance, when he calls the body of Christ in the eucharist, a *spiritual body*, it is in the same sense in which St. Paul says of our bodies, that without ceasing to be real, they will be *spiritual* bodies after the resurrection. (1 Cor. xv, 66.) When he says that the mystery of the eucharist is performed *spiritually*, it is to signify a divine operation remote from the perception of sense. When he speaks of *a figure*, far from excluding the reality, he on the contrary means that the remaining appearances of the bread and wine are the veil under which Christ is concealed and really present. When the words *substance, body, corporally, corporeal*, are applied to the eucharistic elements, it is to designate what *appears to be substance*, the *body* of exterior qualities, shape, color, taste, and other appearances; (See Nos. 9, 10, 13, 16.) When it is said that the body of Christ in the eucharist is not the *very same* which was born of the B. Virgin, which suffered, which was nailed to a cross; that it exists there not in its form (*specie*), but in virtue; all this is merely to exclude from the sacrament the natural, visible and passible state of Christ during his mortal life, and to show that Christ, although really present in the eucharist, is not seen there, nor eaten after the manner of ordinary meats, but under the veil of the sacrament. (See nos. 56, 57.)

Nor is this an unfounded interpretation, gratuitously attributed to Ratramn; it is based upon the whole tenor of his work, upon the rules of sound criticism and a variety of forcible considerations. 1. Good sense and common justice require that, instead of judging of what is plain in an author from what is obscure, we should, on the contrary, elucidate and explain what may be obscure from what is plain and consistent. 2. It is reasonable, when any discussion of this nature arises, to abide by the judgment of those who examined the question with an unbiassed mind, before the controversy arose. Now, it is certain that, up to the time when Protestants endeavored to extort from Ratramn's work, something favorable to their views, it had always been quoted or mentioned as a Catholic work, first by Gerbert, who was elected to the papacy under the name of Silvester II, in 999, and lastly by Fisher, bishop of Rochester, in his treatise against Œcolampadius in 1526. Not even did Berengarius, the first declared enemy of the real presence, who found himself attacked by all the doctors of his age, and condemned by the whole Church, ever dream of adducing Ratramn's treatise in favor of his innovation. 3. The very English translators of the little work must have been much of the same opinion, since they judged it necessary, in order to make it answer their purpose, to alter its expressions in several places. 4. Ratramn himself has defined the real meaning of his book, by concluding it with these words: "Let it not be thought from my saying this, that in the mystery of the sacrament, the body and blood of the Lord are not received by the faithful." (S. CI.) 5. He had, before and at the very beginning, called the eucharist "a great and secret mystery; a subject far remote from human senses, and into which no one can penetrate, except by the teaching of the Holy Ghost." (Sec. 3, 4.) But now, what great mystery is there, nay, what semblance of mystery at all, if Christ be really and substantially absent, and if the bread and wine, preserving their nature, remain what they were before, namely a few drops of wine and a piece of bread!

We consider these reasons amply sufficient to satisfy every impartial and reasonable mind about the catholicity of Ratramn.

Again: "This mystery is a pledge [so the Catholic Church calls it, *a pledge of eternal life*] and a figure: [of Christ really present in it, for] Christ's body is truth itselfe. This pledge we doe keep mystically, until that we be come to the truth itselfe [as the council of Trent expresses it, *without any veil*], and then is this pledge ended. Truly it is so, as we before have said, Christ's body and his blood: not bodily, but ghostly. And ye should not search how it is done, but hold it in your beleefe that it is so done."

After this, Ælfric relates, in proof of his doctrine, two miracles in which the holy eucharist, by the permission of God, appeared to different persons under the form of flesh and blood. These the English editor carefully suppresses, under the honest pretence that they are tales, nay *infarced tales*. (See note of p. 97.) Whether tales or not, we shall not examine; one thing is certain, that Ælfric considered them true and real miracles, and related them as such. Now, it is easy to understand that he did so to prove the change of the eucharistic bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. But that he should have had recourse to the above facts, to show that Christ is not substantially present in the eucharist, and that, instead of any transubstantiation taking place, the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine, is so ridiculous a supposition that nothing more so could possibly be imagined.

After all it is a matter of no moment for us to find the Catholic doctrine either in Ælfric or Ratramn; and though for the sake of truth, we cannot grant, yet, for the sake of argument, we are willing to suppose that their tracts on the eucharist have perhaps a Protestant meaning; what advantage will this hypothesis afford the system of our opponents? None whatever. The Catholic Church has nothing more to fear from her obscure than from her declared enemies. Her doctrine is invariable, like the rock upon which she is built,—like her divine founder himself; "and whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." (Matt. xxi, 44.)

Far then, from having held, either in the ninth, or in any preceding or subsequent century, a belief different from what she holds at present, we maintain, and shall prove, we hope, to the satisfaction of the reader, that the assertion of our opponents on this head is nothing short of a complete absurdity, and that all their efforts to establish their point are not only unavailing, but serve merely to show more and more the utmost weakness of their cause. This will be the subject of another article in the next number.

---

## CATHOLIC MELODIES.

NO. V.

RELIGION and reason alike proclaim that, according to the plans of infinite wisdom, the contemplation of the material world was destined by the divine Architect to something more than mere earthly purposes; to raise the mind of man to the great Author of his being, to serve as a mirror in which the perfections of the Deity were to be reflected as the continual object of his adoration and love. With this original order of Providence, the true worship of God has in all ages accorded. We every where see the outward world ministering to the spiritual, because human nature, composed of matter as well as of spirit, requires the aid of exterior things to impress the soul with ideas and feelings of a religious and devotional character. Hence the offering of sacrifice under the law of nature, and the majestic ceremonial of the Israelitic dis-

pensation. Far from having revoked or changed this order of things, the divine founder of Christianity has on the contrary inculcated its perfection, by teaching a more sublime morality, and establishing more intimate relations between man and his Creator.

His religion is eminently symbolical. The sacraments, which he has made the channels of his grace, are symbols; and the Church itself instituted by him, is but an outward symbol of the inward and divine influence which is directed to the sanctification of souls. The primitive Christians, imbued with a deep spirituality, only developed this tendency of the religion which they had learned, when almost at every moment they expressed themselves in some exterior symbol of the divine mercy and goodness; and among the practices which prevailed in those ages of pure and fervent faith, was the use of the sign of the cross. "When we walk," says Tertullian, "when we come in, when we go out, when we warm ourselves, go to bathe, sit at table, light candles, go to bed, in short, in all our actions and deportments, we mark ourselves with the sign of the cross. If you are obstinate in demanding Scripture for every discipline and usage of this kind, you will find none. But they are supported by tradition which authorizes them, by custom which confirms them, and faith which observes them." What more beautiful and more eloquent memorial of the Saviour's incomprehensible love for man, and of the example which he traced for the imitation of his followers, than the sign of the cross? The Church, his earthly spouse, has always cherished it with peculiar veneration, and everywhere exhibited it to her children as the symbol of their faith and of their hopes. What is the cross but the whole science of Jesus Christ crucified? Cold and cheerless indeed must be that philosophy or religion which does not find in that sacred emblem a nutriment of true devotion. Among a certain class of persons, the use of ceremonies and symbols for secular purposes is acknowledged to possess its advantages. They admire it in the military costume and banner, as well as in the miniature that preserves the memory of friendship or affection. Why then, should symbolism have no religious application? Why should that instinctive disposition of the human heart, to foster the best sentiments of nature by the aid of external things, be checked in the elevation of the soul to the highest object that can possibly claim its consideration? To oppose this innate propensity would be acting against every dictate of reason, and every law of experience; for while the former teaches us that any agency tending to the moral culture of man, may be safely directed to the honor of God, we learn from the latter, as a distinguished modern writer has observed, that "for the mass of mankind, busily occupied from morning till night with the things of the world, the things of sense must be raised up to heaven by the spirit, or they will drag the spirit down to hell." This principle was well understood by our forefathers, and hence it was that by various monuments and customs they brought the exterior and spiritual world into a beautiful harmony. Among other objects that arrested the attention of the passer-by, was the emblem of our Saviour's passion. "Innumerable crosses of stone or wood were erected by the public ways, in the heart of forests and amidst the wildest scenes of nature, on bridges, which heard amidst the eternal murmur of the streams, the chant of nocturns in the night, and on the craggy summit of islands that lay far in the melancholy sea; that no place might be left without the symbol of human redemption, and the memorial of the passion of Jesus."* This sacred representation sanctified the shades of retirement, while on the high-ways it bade the pilgrim pause and offer up a prayer to the throne of mercy. By these or similar demonstrations has the veneration of the cross of Christ displayed itself in every age of the Christian era, and it points with irresistible evidence to the Church that still cherishes the spirit and the practice of primitive times. Ed.

* Ages of Faith, vol. ii.

## THE WAYSIDE CROSS.

It is a custom, familiar to all who have travelled in the Catholic countries of Europe, to mark the spot, where a murder has been committed, by the erection of a cross. The following stanzas were suggested by the picture of a wooden cross overgrown by a vine.

It stands, as ages past it stood,
Beside the road, that cross of wood,
By living vines o'ergrown;
And from their tendrils as they twine,
As from all nature's vast design,
A lesson may be shown.

'Tis said that in the olden time,
Upon that spot some fearful crime
Of blood and wrong was wrought;
And that in after years there came
A grey haired man, bowed low with shame,
Its faded trace who sought.

Here 'mid repentance deep and prayers
He raised this cross bedewed with tears
And sighs in anguish given;
And pious pilgrims bend the knee,
Whene'er the sacred sign they see,
In prayer for him to heaven.

But be the legend false or true,
Who feel not as this cross they view
Emotions strong arise?
And filled with hope, or bowed in fear,
Who lifts not in devotion here,
The heart beyond the skies?

On life's highway who hath not known,
Some cross all unexpected shown
His heedless course to stay?
And as the chastened spirit knelt,
Like a peace messenger hath felt,
The hallowed sign to pray.

Sustaining grace who hath not found,
When, like the vine, the cross around,
Each bitter grief was flung?
Its apex pointing to the sky,
Hath raised the drooping soul on high,
Which firmly to it clung.

Symbol of shame! whereon once died
The Lord of life, with thieves beside
And scoffing crowds below,
How changed thy destiny since he,
To whom all nations bow the knee,
Was doomed thy pangs to know!

Symbol of glory! now we turn
To yon tall spire on which upborne,
Thy golden beauty plays;
Beneath the sun's meridian light,
Or through the starry veil of night,
We mark thy beacon rays.

Guiding the faithful near or far,
And shining now, as shone the star
Of Bethlehem, when of yore,
The sages of the ancient days,
With firm resolve and steadfast gaze,
Followed its mystic lore.

They knew the holy herald led
Though resting o'er a lowly shed
*To life's true source within;*
And urged by faith, impelled by love,
They strove the precious boon to prove,
Cleansing the soul from sin.

And taught by him* whose simplest word
Conviction won from all who heard,
We learn to honor thee;
The cross of Christ, the crucified,
Our only hope, our only pride,
Our only glory be!

Then hail, blest symbol of that faith,
Whose precepts o'er life's pilgrim hath
An influence strong as pure!
Bidding each wayward passion cease
While to the care worn comes thy peace,
In hopes that must endure.

When danger frights, and courage fails,
And tempting vice the soul assails,
And years their trials bring,
Oh! how the faithful spirit yearns,
In fondness to the cross, and turns
Thus vinelike there to cling.

Then gladly on his weary way,
Here let the traveller pause to pay
The homage of his prayers;
For to his soul, like landmarks given,
Guiding his wandering steps to heaven,
Each wayside cross appears!

*St. Louis, Mo.* MOÏNA.

* St. Paul to the Galatians (vi, 14) says, "God forbid that I should glory but in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

# THE EDICT OF NANTES.

BY ROBERT HARE.

THE Edict of Nantes is one of those subjects which form the staple of a great deal of writing and declamation, often without any precise ideas as to its character, or as to the traits of the times when it was adopted, or when it was revoked. It is the object of this lecture to attempt to describe its circumstances and results; and that without assuming to decide what was right or what was wrong, either in comparison with our own ideas, or those of the times which it immediately concerned.

Toleration in all matters, is said to be a principle of this age. It is professed to be, and for the most part is felt in all public transactions and affairs. It is fortunate it is so far adopted and realized, since it cannot be said that opinion has lost much of its intenseness or exclusiveness, whether it be opinion in matters of religion, of conduct, of politics, or of one's own wisdom. Toleration is the *avowed rule* of the age, and it has been agreed upon because it is found better for the community, that *all opinions* should be tolerated, than that any man should suffer, as for a crime, punishment, which in truth might be inflicted upon his greater weakness or his greater sagacity, and perhaps, also, because it is more charitable that we should exert ourselves to bear with the opinions of another, than visit upon him the bitterness of our own self-love.

Mankind were, for a long time, endeavoring to find out, embody, enforce, and practise this doctrine of toleration, and it is now only in the weakness of immaturity. It has grown to be recognized as a public principle, and it is to be hoped it may from being a public principle, in the course of time, become a private pleasure. Whatever it may be now, or may be destined to become, toleration was neither a principle, nor a duty, nor a pleasure, of any part of mankind in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the discomfort or desolation which then flowed from intolerance is as chargeable upon one set of opinions and of men as another. The pleasures and advantages which spring from toleration are as much due to the spirit of one faith as another—are attributable to no one creed or doctrine, nor to any one band of men or writers.

The brief and imperfect sketch of the history of the Edict of Nantes, which it is the purpose of this lecture to present, may show the course of the passions which beget intolerance, and which for so long time affected mankind, as it may show, also, the sincerity and risk with which in those days opinions were held and furthered.

The Reformation, as it is commonly called, broke out in Germany about the year 1520. Soon after Luther's first demonstration of opposition to Rome, the excitement of its discussions was extended into France where, however, it was for some time dissipated rather than strengthened, by the variety of opinions which this new religion had produced among those who were not unwilling to take part in the movement. His own particular doctrines (which varied with his temper or his friends), were not at first adopted there by any set of men, and the greatest effect which he engendered, was rather in diverting the attention with what he called the abuses of Rome, (and it never was denied that there were many among the lower clergy) than in rendering men dissatisfied with the tenets of the Catholic faith.

He was soon, however, followed by Zuingle whose doctrines of faith being for the most part afterwards embodied in the Institutes of Calvin, attracted large numbers of followers since known as Calvinists, the Lutherans having been always a very small party in point of numbers or influence among the French seceders generally called Huguenots.

The then monarch of France, Francis I, whose memory is always to be cherished for his gallant and chivalrous disposition,

and whose name is more solidly established as that of the father of letters, engaged in frequent war with all Europe, and particularly with his great rival Charles V, found it necessary by the force of political motives to temporize for the most part with the Reformers, who, therefore, though occasionally the objects of edicts and punishments designed to suppress the growing heresy gradually, in the course of his long reign, acquired great strength and importance from their numbers, ability, and even learning. The novelty had the same or greater success under his immediate successor Henry II, but was in some degree diminished by the power and influence of the great duke of Guise in the time of Francis II. The murder of this great duke by Poltrot, the agent of the Protestant party, freed all parties from the restraint which had hitherto confined them, and a civil war broke out which for length, bitterness, and desolation, has never been equalled; in which the balance of cruelty and slaughter, whether on one side or the other has never been, and never can be settled, and to envenom and embitter which all the ingredients of theological hatred, fear of tyranny, resistance to innovation, and disgust at ancient practices were combined with horror and aversion for adverse opinions and persons, with the frenzy of political partizanship and the extravagance of ignorance and superstition. It was in this then most unhappy country that in the next reign occurred that terrible and unspeakable massacre of St. Bartholomew by the Catholics, not to be accounted for except as an ebullition of universal madness, and perhaps not to be equalled in history, except by the atrocious slaughters of Dauphiné and Mornas by the Protestants; for the histories of these times, on each side, in revealing (what we might almost wish had never been known beyond their age) the horrors and hatred of each party, without shame, sometimes even with insane satisfaction, prove that neither side was more free from blame—was more Christian, or more generous than the other, and that of either the murder and cruelty were restrained only by the want of power.

The civil war—the result of the Reformation, was led on by Condé and Coligny on the one side, and the dukes of Guise on the other. Reconciliation seemed to be impossible, for it involved an abandonment of religious faith, and (what was then as insupportable) the toleration of another's, or of political connection to violate which was only to furnish the motives of another contest. The monarch himself was not the leader nor even the principal of his own party, which was connected, not by the sentiment of personal or even political loyalty, but by religion; and such terms as he granted to his adversaries, or such as he was compelled to receive from Condé and Coligny were subject to the pleasure and approbation of his followers and masters.

There were many good and wise men on each side in those days, as there are always in times of high excitement and disunion, and they were listened to as much as wise and just and liberal men are heard by crowds of bigots and madmen. There was the Admiral Coligny on the side of the Huguenots, a skilful, prudent leader, and brave soldier, who might have commanded the confidence of his adversaries, but that he was believed, and upon good reason, to have been the worst instigator of the murder of the great duke of Guise by Poltrot. There was the famous Chancellor L'Hospital on the part of the actual government. Coligny maintained his power and influence in his party until his death, and does not appear ever to have yielded points which at this day would be regarded as trivial, and to compromise which might have brought about a pacification. The other L'Hospital, steadfast in his devotion to humanity rather than party, enacted and registered laws tending to harmony and peace, for which he was suspected and disowned by those whom he supported, and at last dismissed by the court.

Henry III succeeded Charles IX, in 1574. At that time the Huguenots amounted in numbers to about two millions, and formed perhaps a sixth of the population, a larger proportion than they preserved, and always too small to justify them in a political truce at least in their hope and attempt to change the national faith, and the

constitutional, religious, and political features of the kingdom. Their desire and object were that in all those towns where they formed a majority, the Catholic worship should be abolished, and in those where they were in a minority their own should be tolerated. By one of the first edicts of pacification, that of Henry III, granted to the Huguenots the liberty to build churches, and hold synods wherever they pleased, except within two leagues of the court. He enacted that of seven parliaments, among which were Paris, Toulouse and Grenoble, the one half of the members should be Catholics, and the other Protestants, and that the children of those who had suffered in the massacre of St. Bartholomew should be released from payment of taxes for six years. He gave to Condé the government of Picardy and Peronne—he allowed the Protestants to retain as cautionary of his good faith, certain fortified towns in Dauphiné and elsewhere, of which they were to nominate the governors, and he agreed that the states general should be assembled in six months for the redress of grievances.

Their own historian states that as soon as they had obtained this edict, the Huguenots regretted that they had not asked for more, and the Catholics then rose in anger against their exaggerated and importunate demands. The Parliament refused to register this edict except with certain conditions, and both parties again resorted to arms. The Catholics then formed the famous league of which the avowed motive was to protect religion, the king, and the liberty of the state. At the head of it was Henry II, great duke of Guise, and it numbered the principal gentlemen of France, but its multitude was composed of the people, and its character was essentially popular. It was eagerly embraced in Picardy and Peronne, which the king had given to the Protestants. It was extended throughout the kingdom as a chain that linked men rather to their religion than their government, and was perhaps the most honest and obstinate interest in the kingdom. During the dissentions of the league, says the historian of the Protestants, the Catholics and Huguenots fought with each other, murdered, deceived and poisoned each other, and agreed only in devastating the provinces where both happened to be.

At the death of Henry III, the two parties fought for a throne as well as for religion. Henry IV, was at the head of the Protestant array, and entitled in the order of descent to the crown. He had been born and bred a Protestant—had been reconciled to the Church in the time of Charles IX, and in the mutations of politics had abjured its faith. He was disliked by the great mass of the people as a Protestant, and in some sense as a stranger in birth. The Catholics set up the Cardinal de Bourbon, as Charles X, and in the course of the furious wars which followed, Henry again abjured Protestantism, doing this upon the advice of the wisest and most honest of his party, of Du Plessis Mornay for instance, and of Sully who told him, "It fits you to be a Catholic, and it fits me to be a Protestant, for the canon of the mass is the best cannon to conquer Paris." The ministers of his party sent a deputation to remonstrate with him, but one of them, who must be acknowledged to have been strangely liberal in those days, having admitted that a man *might be saved* in the Catholic faith, the king obtained an advantage over them, when he said, "In that case as a matter of prudence it is better I should be a Catholic than a Protestant, for both you and they agree that I might then be saved; but in your religion I have only your word and not your adversaries for my salvation."

He was then, on the 25th of July, 1593, again received into the Catholic Church, and large bodies of those, whose opposition had been prompted only by his religious affinities, withdrew upon this event from the contest. After some desperate battles with the army under the duke of Mayenne, now opposing him at the instigation of Spain, whose monarch's designs extended to an invasion of France, and the possession of her crown, he entered Paris and ascended the throne in 1593.

But his success did not at least immediately, either weaken the violence of his own party, or command the entire confidence of the Catholics, and after various

favors granted or renewed by him in ease of the Protestants, the relief of whom scarcely soothed their violence, while it excited that of their rivals, he promulgated in August, 1598, his famous edict of Nantes, securing to the Protestants by law, the enjoyment of all the rights of a French subject, and absolving them from the consequences of their heresy and rebellion: this edict being the first manifestation which the world had yet seen of a spirit of toleration—the first act by which, since the breaking out of the Reformation, religious discord, hatred and persecution were to cease in a nation of Christians, though of different faiths.

For the understanding of the tolerance and necessity of this famous edict it is fit to observe that by the constitutions of all nations in those days, a heretic or one avowing opinions contrary to the faith or peace of the Church or sect as established, was necessarily a rebel and a criminal in the state. Intolerance was both a public duty and a public principle, and all the laws which in all nations were promulgated for the suppression of the faith and doctrines of the minority, inflicted penalties only for what was in *all* regarded as a crime. Such laws and penalties were not the dictates of kings or ministers, but an expression of the universal sentiment or popular will;—as much so as if they had been passed in assemblies of the people by an unrelenting and savage majority. Nor was this popular will itself a novel, or sudden, or violent impulse, but on the contrary a necessary act of duty, in complete consistency with their sense of piety, and with the fixed aversion which men whose minds were violently agitated by theological discussion, felt for those whose faith they believed to be erroneous—and being erroneous, to be bad and sinful.

The power of the Church, as it was called, had but the direct—even if mistaken (and who shall say it was mistaken)—application of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, to the temporal, political and actual affairs and pursuits of men; and those who seceded in England, Germany, France and elsewhere, did so, claiming that in them remained the same power to make the same direct, and as they thought, better application of their ideas to the same concerns and objects. And the variety and extent of this attempt to apply their own construction and belief to the conduct and duties of other men may be imagined, when it is observed that every man was then supposed to be at liberty to form his own theory; and if he were eloquent and skilful, to become the leader of a sect, though at the same time it may be remarked that he who formed peculiar opinions and was not also able to support them by a sect, was generally forced to give up his theory or his life.

The Protestants called their fellow Christian Catholics, idolaters and slaves to Rome, bigots and followers of Antichrist, and founded themselves to support their denunciations upon their own construction of the Bible. The Catholics despised their arguments and conclusions, but considered and treated them as enemies to their faith, their government, and their persons. The Protestants would not have been less wise or less humane, if they had contented themselves with their own doctrines and construction, and left their adversaries to their faith in this world, and their fate in the next. The Catholics stood upon the doctrine of the Church which forbade rebellion in matters of faith and discipline—by the force of which principle they are, for any thing that is known to the contrary, the same now as they have been for eighteen hundred years. The Protestants adhered to their own sense of rectitude—by the force of which rule they thought they were justified in correcting all the errors of all the rest of the world.

When, therefore, Henry IV, a Catholic monarch but lately reconciled to the Church, suspected by the great Catholic nations, scarcely yet trusted by any portion of his own subjects, and more than doubted by the Protestants, granted this edict under the advice of Catholic counsellors, with the approbation of Catholic bishops, and even of the Pope, he and even they are to be looked upon, not only as preceding both their adversaries and the age in liberality and philanthropy, but as perilling, for the sake of harmony, peace, and humanity, his crown

and person, the stability of the monarchy, and the lives and happiness of those of their own faith,—since to admit the Protestants to equal rights was to admit the operation of all their principles, and to afford to them the means of again creating the same civil war which had followed every concession hitherto made to them. He was favored by his own genius that he escaped them.

The liberality and philanthropy of this edict are still more striking, when it is considered that the liberty of conscience, of worship, and of opinion was granted to a small minority, whose extinction in any prolonged contest, was a matter of certainty, and to a small minority whose objects, politically, were to overthrow the established religion and law of the land, by the force of arms, as well as of opinions but newly put forth and received by the rest of the nation, who, as greater in number, may be presumed to have been their more than equal in wisdom. It is farther to be considered that this minority was endeavoring to force upon the nation its own opinions, and that those of the same faith who here granted to the minority the *indulgence* of liberty—for such it was in those days—were in other countries exposed to the penalties and punishment which attended upon an adherence to their own conscience after their monarch or ruler had changed his doctrines.

As this edict consists of ninety-two articles or heads, many of them of only momentary importance or character, it is impossible and unnecessary to give any very minute narration of it. It commands the cessation of religious differences in the shape of wars, troubles, and defamatory libels on the faith of either side. It gives to the Protestants (always styled of the *pretended* reformed religion—a qualification which was equally annoying to them and necessary in a nation which did not admit theirs to be a reformed religion)—it gives to them security in their residence where they please,—preserving them against molestation or constraint for the exercise of their religion; and moreover forbids all public prosecutions for any thing done during the troubles. It ordains that the Catholic religion shall exist in all places and parts of the kingdom, and gives to the ecclesiastics of both sides who had been dispossessed of their churches or other property, the right to buy the same back again, or to constrain the actual owner to buy them at a price to be fixed by arbitration of their own choice. Disinheritance or deprivations made on account of adverse religious opinions, were utterly void for time past and to come,—a provision of which it may be observed that it proves as much sense of religious toleration, as insensibility to the rights of persons. The Huguenots were to respect holy and festival days, and their hirelings were not to work out of their shops nor in them, so as to disturb the sacredness of the occasion,—a provision promoting charity, since to disturb the days was as offensive as here would be the open violation of Sunday, and even in case of a breach of this rule the search for and arrest of the offender was vested exclusively in the officers of justice. The public worship according to their religion was secured to the Huguenots in certain places, in town and country, where they formed a majority, and it was forbidden to either party to be guilty of irreverence in the sight of the other, or towards his belief. But the public worship of the Catholics was not limited to any place, upon the obvious principle that the minority was not to be equal to the majority—and as the worship of the Protestants was permitted in all those places in which they formed any considerable body, they in truth suffered under no real privation. And as they were limited to particular places (however impolitic such a limitation might be as tempting to an undue concentration of their force in such places), they were less likely to be involved in turmoils and contentions with the populace. In all other respects, however, the Protestant was to enjoy all the rights of a Catholic subject of France, and it may be observed that in this respect no Protestant had ever been deprived of them; their poor and sick were to be admitted into the hospitals; a provision made in restraint of the superstition of the lower orders; they were eligible to any post, office, or station—civil or military. In each parliament, a chamber, equally composed of Catholic and

Huguenot judges, was formed for the trial of causes. Their ministers received support from the crown (and it may be observed that Catholic France is now the only country in the world where dissenters receive public support), and they were allowed to hold, and for many years did hold, general assemblies and conventions, both religious and political, for the management of their own affairs,—under certain regulations, however, which were made with a view to restrain their political and unpatriotic affinities. Lastly, Henry allowed them to retain in their power certain towns and fortified places, partly as a proof of his own good faith and of his confidence in them as good subjects—but more from a sentiment of humanity as providing them with a certain refuge in the event of a popular ebullition.

This edict, therefore, contains all the principles of toleration, and almost all its details—all certainly that it was safe or prudent to grant, considering the immense majority of the Catholics, the fixedness of their faith, in which those who did not for one motive or another abandon it, only became more steadfast and convinced,—and the bitterness on both sides, the more exasperated as the result of a civil war, in which the dictates, not only of all religion, but of humanity, had been forgotten, from the time of the assassination of the duke of Guise to the general pacification. Comparing the edict with the present ideas, prevailing in this country, of equal rights, it is certainly liable to objection. But comparing it with the ideas or laws of Germany and England, and other Protestant nations, as they existed before 1598, and down to the beginning of this century, it is a solitary instance of humanity, wisdom, and toleration in religious or political concerns.

This edict was formed upon repeated consultations with the Huguenot ministers and leaders, and canvassed by their conscientious arrogance with the secretary of a hostile power. It was at last made acceptable to them, and extremely distasteful to the Catholics, who, from the scarcity of examples, had not yet learned the beauty of toleration; and when it was finally decreed and promulgated, the one party having got so much more than they could with any reason have aspired to hope—the other received it in silence, and submitted to it in charity and faith.

The particular arrangements and details of it had been entrusted by Henry IV to four of his ministers—men celebrated for their ability, learning, and skill,—two Catholics and two Protestants, who separately and together reflected and deliberated upon its provisions for two years,—for they, sensible of the good faith of their monarch, knew that what they were about to promulgate was to become an almost organic law of the kingdom, the principles of which could never be annulled, and the expression and details of which, therefore, required the most delicate consideration of rival and often bitterly hostile interests. When the edict was published, as much nicety was required to compound and settle the heartburnings and jealousies which it occasioned.

In the course of a little time the two parties began to be accustomed to their novel and somewhat awkward condition of civility and humanity towards each other,—the inconsiderateness of zeal, and the turbulence of opinion were gradually suppressed by mildness and by punishment. And the sentiment that the rights of each party were bounded and secured by law, inspired both with respect and reverence for the government.

In this state the parties remained until about the year 1616, without any violent outbreak, and without any more serious trouble than that of compelling the courts to listen to claims and complaints, sometimes reasonable, sometimes vexatious, and generally irritating, though of very small moment. And if the Huguenots had not been led by the very nature of their institutes to sympathise with the political tendencies of other countries, they probably would never have had occasion to complain of constraint or persecution. But in 1615 they were suspected, and as one at least of their historians admits, suspected with reason, of a political design to form a distinct government—and that a republic—in France, and to separate themselves from the nation. In

this object they, for his personal ambition, were encouraged and courted by Henry, prince of Condé, then upon ill terms with the regent and the court; and him they would have adopted as their leader, but that he soon after abandoned his treasonable intentions.

The Protestants at this time amounted to little more than a million in France, so much had the edict of Nantes, peace and indifference, diminished their vivacity and numbers. Their general conventions had been regularly held, without any other difference with the state than such as the bickerings of their bigots about trifles might produce. They had made no complaint of injustice, of want of faith, or of good feeling on the part of the people or government; nor does there appear to have existed any grievance at all—none certainly which moderation and calmness on their side would not have dispelled. In the towns, there were occasional quarrels between the lower orders, who, perhaps, only made use of religion and party to indulge their natural pugnacity, and in these the government protected the Reformed—for even their own historian tells, that a cow belonging to a poor man named Colas, having *ignorantly*, and against its nature, forced a way into one of their conventicles during service, the indignant congregation, with a stern devotion to principle, condemning it to death, in a body arose and executed judgment, which event being commemorated in a satirical ballad called "*Vache à Colas*," or "*The Cow of Colas*," the singing of it in the streets in derision of the Reformed, produced so many bloody noses and cracked crowns that it was forbidden, by proclamation, under pain of capital punishment. Their own historian says that they appear, after this bucolical outrage, to have remained in the enjoyment of undisturbed repose. Privileges, over and above the rights secured by the edict, were certainly granted to them, in respect to the places of worship, and on one occasion at least the king was obliged to go at the head of his troops in person to suppress a tumult which the establishment of one of their churches had excited.

In 1619, the violence of religious discord again broke out, not as heretofore, only and entirely because one man believed in one mystery and another in more, but upon other more worldly and visible causes. The edict of Nantes, as declared by the king, differed in one or two unimportant particulars from that promulgated and registered by the parliament, who had exercised the right which, then, undoubtedly belonged to them, of refusing to register except under such terms as they pleased. The differences, as stated by the Protestant historian, were first, that of assembling in a political assembly every two years, without or with the king's permission; and secondly, that of nominating two persons to reside at court to further their requests, instead of offering six from whom the king was to select two. These and other particulars evidently trifles, made of importance by certain men, the duke de Bouillon and others, whose object was by exciting the Huguenots to obtain so much power as might control the court, were first insisted on in 1611, and the demands repeated in every subsequent assembly. In 1619 the Huguenots refused to break up their political convention until their demands were granted, and as the quarrel grew, the sessions of the assembly were transferred from Loudun to La Rochelle. Here they repeated their requests, and upon reproaching to the king, Louis XIII, that he had curtailed privileges granted both by Henry III, and Henry IV, he answered that the first had granted them through fear, and the last through love, but for his part, he neither feared nor loved them. Upon which answer as refusing their demands, the Reformers declared war: gathered together an army of twenty thousand men: guaranteed a payment of one hundred thousand crowns a month, and appointed as their leader one whose name is known—Les Diguieres, as among the ablest and most distinguished of the generals of that time, and whose military and political skill had given them most of the advantages which they possessed—but Les Diguieres had lately abjured the new religion for which conversion he is of course denounced as bribed, though he rejected the sword of constable which the king offered to him. The assembly then

offered the command of their army to the duke de Bouillon, who also declined it, and they finally chose a man who deserved their confidence for his ability, integrity and steadfastness—the duke de Rohan. The assembly reserved the superintendence of all concerns, military and political, for themselves, and in testimony of their intention to divide the kingdom, coined a seal, the legend upon which still puzzles antiquaries, whether it was "for Christ and for his flock," or "for Christ and for the king;" but, says their historian, it can scarcely be denied that the assembly in either case intended to disclaim the authority of the state.

Even after all this the king, though he published a declaration against the assembly, promised continued protection to all the Protestants who should remain unshaken in their allegiance. He even took part against delinquents engaged in outrages upon the reformed, and then proceeded to take possession of Saumur, one of the fortified towns then occupied and held by the Protestants.

From this time began a war which terminated with the siege of Rochelle and its capture in 1628, by the king's forces under the instruction of that most capable of all great men, the Cardinal de Richelieu. It began and was ended as a war evidently between political parties, the one striving to throw off the royal authority, and to establish its own form of government, the other to preserve its accustomed rights, and secure what it of course preferred, the constitutional and established political and religious system of France. It was a contest strictly and purely political, and with which religion had nothing to do, except to embitter its current. Nothing is more false or more mistaken, than the tales which are told of this contest, as a persecution for religion and against conscience. The same persecution—that is, military opposition, would and must have taken place if both parties had been Catholics, or both Protestants, and that it was purely a political contest—a contest just preceding, and wonderfully resembling the great rebellion which took place about ten years afterwards in England, is proved by the meagreness of the religious grievances which the Huguenots set forth.

With the fall of La Rochelle began the decline of the Huguenots. Almost all their principal leaders in war or politics had abandoned them for the ancient faith. The lenity with which all were treated by the government, after their subjugation, deprived them of the character of martyrs, and they could not, at that day, with any power of face, allege persecution. The duke de Rohan, and the prince de Soubise his brother, were both permitted to escape, and both returned to France. The great mass was left in the possession of all the civil rights, which the edict of Nantes secured to them; but the political assemblies being forbidden, and the great political error of Henry IV, the leaving in their hands armed and fortified towns being corrected, they were deprived of all the qualities which had enabled them to threaten to become a distinct and independent body in the state. Neither cruelties nor murders were committed, nor attempts made to change their faith, and they soon, in the absence of their political leaders, by the genius of Richelieu, and the dexterity of Mazarin, sunk, with the full enjoyment of their conscience and their annual synods, into an honest and ill-tempered insignificance, from which they only occasionally emerged to take part in the quarrels and commotions which beset the minority of Louis XIV. From this time until 1685, when it was finally repealed, the edict of Nantes remained in force. The revocation of it was gradual, and at first gentle, and the final decree was directed against those who gave no kind of security for their qualities as good subjects. The principle of the revocation was professed to be the desire to unite all persons, living under the same government, in one faith, and one bond of opinion, seeing that the differences of religion led in those times and countries, when its doctrines entered into every thing, and every thing into its doctrines—to political combinations and ideas totally inconsistent with internal peace and security. The first means of obtaining this object adopted by Louis XIV, immediately after he took upon himself in 1641 the government of his kingdom, were famous; such as the release of new converts from certain taxes and contributions—even preference in admitting them

to the posts and employments in the army, in finances, in commerce, and in the courts. This was said to be bribery, but it was at least humanity and kindness—a better spirit than the faggot or the fine of other nations—better even than the denunciations of modern days. The government also took advantage of such disturbances as the inconsiderateness and often wanton zeal of the Huguenots provoked, to diminish or recall the particular privileges granted to the congregation. Gradually the admissibility of the obstinate Protestants to public office was rendered difficult, and finally impossible. Those who had been preferred were desired to retire. The bar was shut to them—the business of the government was not intrusted to them, and many, even of the private pursuits of life, were forbidden, and at last, in the course of twenty-five years from the accession of Louis, or rather the death of Mazarin, the revocation was resolved upon, ordained and promulgated without creating any public war, commotion or rebellion.

The policy of Richelieu after the reduction of La Rochelle—which policy was continued by Mazarin and prevailed for many years with Louis XIV—was to treat the Huguenots kindly, to secure them in their rights, and to take all the measures which might tend to their conversion. For this purpose the successive governments were particular to select for the Protestant districts bishops and civil officers who possessed in their different characters, learning, eloquence, mildness, discretion, and firmness. The consequence of this prudence and charity was the gradual conversion of the Protestants in all the middle and more populous districts of the country, by dispelling the prejudices of their ignorance, soothing their animosity, and elevating their feelings. In the course of about forty years few were found, except in the recesses of France, where they lived in a sort of primitive condition, much like the Vendeans of later days, obeying and reverencing their pastor in the guilelessness of their hearts, just as their ancestors and descendants reverenced their priest or curate; and, though in the want of temptation the most innocent of men,—knowing little or nothing beyond their own daily life, and its monotonous concerns,—yet just by their position and circumstances possessed of those characteristics by which their leaders would most easily excite them to rush into any rebellion or public tumult. There were, indeed, rich and influential Protestants in some of the towns, but these were not often the objects of attack, as their habits of commerce had taught them worldly prudence, and they for the most part remained in France, steadfast in their faith, but not for that disorderly or dangerous subjects.

In these Protestant rural districts the power and majesty of the simple and yet dangerous pastor far outshone that of Louis XIV. Yet his inferiority among them might not have provoked his anger and jealousy, but for the demonstrations so often and, considering their means and ability, so injudiciously and even insolently made, of their resistance to his edicts, of their preference for other countries, for other forms and principles of government, and their construction of the edict of Nantes as a treaty of peace. It was among these innocent people that the past idea of a republic in the midst of France, and that of their being an equal body in the state, were still cherished. And it was the suspicion of their disposition to public tumult and disorder which drew the attention of the government towards them. Thus D'Aguesseau who cannot be suspected of falsehood or mistake, says that in 1683 the sixteen directors of the synod had made a secret resolution, to refuse any longer to obey the laws that had been imposed upon them in respect to management of their meeting-houses. This resolution was known by risings of the Huguenots in three or four places. The Catholics at once took to arms, and the civil war began, on a small scale indeed, but still began.

This event appears to have been the immediate cause of the revocation; and if all the letters and memoirs of the time that have come down to us are evidence of the state of public feeling and opinion in France, they prove that this measure was demanded by the public voice, if that can justify it, and that it was, as promulgated, one of

the most popular acts in the long reign of Louis XIV.

The cruelties, indeed, were not popular; but it is difficult to find in these letters or memoirs any thing to lead one to believe that such horrors and atrocities, as are related to have occurred, did take place without some specific or extenuating cause, or for the most part did take place at all. On the other hand the Protestants who left France filled all Protestant Europe with the complaint that they were the most hardly used of men; and their representations, aided by the fancy of English and Protestant writers (who, however, deserve no credit when France or the Catholic religion is their subject) have filled one's imagination with horrors and tragedies which it is almost mortifying to find are probably poetical. But whether true or false, it is still to be observed that Louvois was then the war minister of Louis XIV, a politician notorious in the history of those times for his cruelty and recklessness, which he carried beyond the bounds of legitimate hostility, even in respect to the national enemy. It was by his orders that bands of brutal soldiers, who are never, as all annals show, so ferocious as against an undisciplined peasantry, were sent into the disaffected and disobedient districts, and though Louis in his great account with posterity, must rightly bear the blame of his minister's folly or wickedness, yet in analysing the event, its causes, and character, it may be doubted whether these cruelties were dictated by religious bigotry, or difference of religious faith, and whether they would not have been equally severe if the rebellion had been composed of disaffected Catholics.

This edict ordered the pastors to quit France, or to conform in two months. To the great body of the Protestants it promised peace, and protection in their business, persons and estate, without question of their religion, of which it prohibited the public worship. The great mass of the sect did remain. The edict forbade any to go, and many escaped, just as if they had been ordered to go, many would have remained. Those who remained were principally the inhabitants of the towns, and to their honor be it said, they continued equally faithful to their religion and their country,—not abandoning the first, nor offending against the laws of the last, and proving the good faith with which the promise of security was kept. The Protestant historians of the event differ much in the numbers of those who left the country. Basnage says from three to four hundred thousand; Martiniere, three hundred thousand; Larry, two hundred thousand; and Rhulieres, the same. But when, after the revocation, the duke of Burgundy caused the proper researches and returns to be made, the highest number was fixed, after all allowances, at about sixty-seven thousand.

It is usual to wind up all declamation upon the subject of this revocation, with lamentations of the injury it inflicted upon France, her commerce, arts, and manufactures, by withdrawing so many artisans, and so much wealth from their country. That they departed with their wealth is certainly no reflection upon the Catholic government. But in truth, of all who left, the artisans formed the smallest proportion, and the arts and advance of France suffered no delay. That other countries were improved by such skill as the French carried into them, is possible, considering the great comparative superiority of France; but if the loss had been infinitely greater than it was, it would not have equalled what she saved in blood, money and happiness, in the event of another civil and religious war. And but for the cruelties which a rude soldiery committed, the event might have happened, without exciting the sympathy of after times, and without leaving upon the memory of Louis XIV, the stain which it is now perhaps impossible to efface, but which the hand of severe and intelligent justice would not have placed there.

For it would not be difficult to show, that, as the edict of Nantes was the first and for two centuries the only European act of liberality in respect to different religious creeds, so the revocation of it, if the principles and practice of the suffering party, in those countries where they formed a majority, are to regulate our opinions, as they are not, was a wise, just, and politic

measure. The revocation is indeed to be deeply regretted—the rather as it appears at this day, that if not made an act of the government, the absorption of the Protestants into the national religion, must soon have effected the desires of the monarch and the people. It is in some sense to be regretted as an act of intolerance, which humanity and Christianity might have interfered to prevent, even at the risk of political disorder and turbulence, and also as an act partly justifying or extenuating the like intolerance and persecution in other countries, of which the party dominant in France supplied the objects, and it is still more deeply to be deplored, because of the sufferings which men of humble life and narrow means, experienced from those who, though sincere in their sense of duty, might have waited for the changes of time, or borne with the temporary aberrations of their adversaries, in the hope of a less painful condition of uniformity of faith.

But in judging of this event, our present sentiments are not the criterion which any rule of justice supplies. The authors of this measure must be judged, so far as we may judge at all, according to the lights which they possessed, and the then state of the human mind. In this respect, mere human justice will not draw from the revocation of the edict of Nantes much reason for accusation and condemnation; for if it were, at that time, a *political* principle universally agreed upon, as a rule in all nations of whatever faith, that different religions should not be tolerated under the same government, and if it were a principle of all religious sects, that one's religious adversary was not a Christian, which it so clearly was, that in all public proceedings of the Huguenots, the Catholics were denounced as the followers of Antichrist, and if it were also a principle of universal law, that one whose opinions were not Christian was not entitled to live in the social compact, nor to enjoy its protection and advantages: all of which principles were so well and universally established by decrees, confessions, synods and councils, as to expose the advocate of tolerance himself to the suspicion and punishment of treason and heresy—then certainly nothing can be more unjust or narrow than to visit upon any one nation, person, or act of those times, the blame which was then due to all, and would now be deserved by any who should be guilty of intolerance or persecution for religious opinions. And if any difference should be made between the intolerance of one party and of the other in those days, mere justice again would teach us that that body was least deserving of censure, and better entitled to excuse, which never having changed nor innovated upon its ancient faith complained that their own confidence in it was weakened, and their peace, security and happiness invaded and destroyed by the professors of new opinions, who in their zeal to spread them, looked upon human beings and human comforts, and human rights, as the least considerable of all impediments.

For it was no part of the duty of the reformer to leave men in the possession of their original sentiments, or even of their right to retain them. It was his sincere and conscientious conviction and still is, that his duty was to preach the gospel as he understood it, to all men blinded and benighted, to use his own cant, by the delusions which had so long enervated their minds, and which still remain to beguile and endanger at least five-sixths of the Christian world. It was his duty to sacrifice himself, and well, and faithfully he often did it; and not only himself, but all princes, people, and commonwealth—to expose them—to plunge them into dissensions, violence, bloodshed, and civil war, in his efforts to convert them to his truth. For this purpose neither political nor civil rights, nor even morals, as all were understood and had been established, were safe from his inroads and conscientious zeal, and with this energy and revolution, were also mixed much of that self-love, that innate conviction of superiority, that confidence in his own election to do the work of the Lord, which while it fortified, also embittered him, and finally led him to the belief that his enemies and opposers were also those of the Almighty, and unfit, therefore, as vessels of wrath and perdition, to be trusted with themselves, or their own religious faith. To be ever wakeful, strenuous

and constant—to overthrow the power of Rome, and place upon its ruins his own theories and domination, though deluding himself and his followers with the promise of a visionary and fantastic liberty, were his principle and characteristic; and if his adversaries had been careless or unmindful of their charge—if they had not been at least as brave, as nerved, and as conscientious as himself—if they had not been indued with the same strength and activity of conviction and enterprise, and if their belief of his errors had not been as fervid as that of their own rectitude, his efforts, speaking upon human perceptions, would probably have had no limits but Christendom. Such characteristics did not consist with tolerance. If it was his duty to preach his opinions, it was their right to retain their own. If it was his duty, and his duty he always construed to be his right, to blame all that they revered, and to violate all that they respected, and to desecrate all that they worshipped, it was their right to refuse to listen —to arrest his attempts, and to punish him for the disturbances he created, and the evil he did, and when the numbers at his side began to make it difficult to punish, the conflict between this constructive right on one side, and a sense of positive right on the other, was to be ended only by that argument which Richelieu expressed, when he inscribed upon the cannon to be used against La Rochelle, "*ultima ratio regum*," the last argument of the state.

The idea of unity of faith was (and is, and must be, however it may be disguised or forgotten) the principle of each sect, and at this time when religious doctrines disturbed the minds of all the world—when the words grace, sanctification, justification, free will, predestination, election, &c., formed the subjects of daily unintelligible conversation and unmeaning dispute among all classes of people—the doctor, the courtier, and the artisan—when conclusions of theology entered into every concern of life, and bore upon all its transactions, public and private, the conflict of opinions became insupportable as fraught with all the dangers and disquietude which the turbulence of a minority directed against the most savage of all despotisms, that of a majority, could engender. The exclusive possession, therefore, not only of the true faith, as involving one's salvation, but of political power as preventing these envenomed discussions and public disorders, necessarily became the trait of each new sect as it successively arose, and the absolute conformity of religion, which always produces more or less conformity of public and private principle and conduct, was regarded, and not without reason, as indispensable in every community and kingdom.

Whatever, therefore, may have been the real or pretended advantages of the Reformation, (and it is not meant to deny that by its reaction it purged the Church of many evils and corruptions, not in respect of its religious faith, but of ecclesiastical practices which had heretofore defiled it,) it never can be presumed by any sane man that toleration, that is, the open profession of any religious belief, was either its avowed or accidental intention or consequence; but this toleration born of the fatigue and disgust which philosophy and men at length experienced in prolonged, innumerable, and irritating disputations, uncertainties, and violence of and concerning doctrines and mysteries, was, and is in direct and diametrical opposition to the principles and practice of its leaders and followers. Nothing can be more false to history, or more unphilosophical, more ignorant even than to contend that religious liberty was, as is daily brayed in our ears, the intention and effect of the Reformation. The liberty of opinion or of conscience, or of public worship according to conscience, was the very last thing which the first or subsequent reformers avowed or permitted, and even at this day it is difficult to perceive that the upholders of the Reformation are more inclined to allow a difference of opinion upon matters of faith, morals or conduct, than are their adversaries, or were their predecessors.

While Luther was shaking the circle which surrounded him, the contest was one between himself and the Pope—a word which, on his side, denoted an individual, and on that of his adversaries a principle. After the outbreak, the quarrel lost the sim-

ple character of an attempt to correct mere abuses, and assumed that of mixed speculation and temporal dominion. The violence of the pulpit and the schools was followed by that of armies, and wherever the Reformation set its foot, civil war, and the worst of civil wars, that of religious intolerance, was found to sprout and flourish. In England it is veiled as a contest for civil rights. In Germany, in France, and in Scotland, it was avowed as religious. In all, however, it was of the same complicated character, and in each it flourished or fell according to the prepossession of the government, or the strength of the arm of flesh. In none was toleration thought of.

"It was then held inconsistent," says a Protestant writer of this day, "with the sovereignty of the magistrate to permit any religion but his own, inconsistent with his duty to suffer any but the true." What was the true was a question to be solved by ministers of the gospel, universities and synods, of the same way of thinking as himself, and he who had not hit upon the true was punishable not only for the publication of the opinion, but for the opinion itself. Thus Luther, whose character, though it shows many of the coarser and more vulgar traits of sensuality, narrowness of views, and abandoned love of popularity, does not appear to possess that of actual cruelty, denounced and held to be worthy of punishment all who differed from him in opinion, and his followers thinking with him, cut off the Calvinists from all salvation, and Calvin himself, in earlier days the object of persecution by his brother reformers, (who at one time drove him from Geneva, where he afterwards re-established himself,) not a civil magistrate, nor charged with judicial authority, nor responsible for any defect of public justice, but possessed of an ecclesiastical influence so great and of power so unequalled, that all that is claimed for a Pope on the score of infallibility is insignificant as compared with what was due to him, denounced James Gruel, a learned man of those days, as heretical in the doctrines of predestination, and deficient in morals, in Calvin's opinion, and Gruel was beheaded for his ideas. He burned Servetus, or rather condemned him to death, for he alleges that he used his influence with the magistrates to change the mode of death to decapitation, but the notion that he had done a wrong act, or one of even doubtful virtue, never disturbed him. Nay the intention to do it did not appear to him to be wrong, for knowing some time before of Servetus' wish to come to Geneva, and that his apprehension of Calvin's resentment deterred him, Calvin writing to two friends said that he would not commit himself—that if Servetus came he should do so at his risk, and that he would not suffer him if he did come to go away safe, (*salvus*) in one letter, alive (*vivus*) in another. Yet Servetus was no disturber of the state—his book had been published in another country—he had never been in Geneva—he had never expressed any opinion within their jurisdiction, and he was forced to this town in flying to escape the persecution against him in Vienne where his book was printed, so that here were civil magistrates, whose power to notice offences was necessarily bounded by their own territory, justified and bound according to the opinion and judgment of Calvin and his fellow theologians, to put to death a man whose mere ideas they judged to be inconsistent with the unity and peace of their Church. So Castalio, another learned man, and author of a translation of the Bible into Latin, was banished by Calvin because he did not embrace predestination in its full extent, and also because he had peculiar ideas about the song of Solomon. Grotius, fifty years after, says of Calvin, that he placed no faith in him as he knew how "iniquitously and virulently he had treated better men than himself, Cassander Balderinus, and Castalio." Even Melancthon, "tolerable mild," who was all for humanity and benevolence, dared not to disapprove of the murder of Servetus, but was induced, in a letter to Beza, to express his approbation of the crime. It is true that Servetus' doctrines were directed equally against all religions, and against all the then sects, but this so far from giving any one a right to punish, might have been in humanity a reason why all should neglect him. Theodore de Beza, the most distinguished

of Calvin's friends, published a work (after Calvin's own justification of himself), in which contending for the propriety of the capital punishments of heretics, he laments that he has in opposition to him, not only such skeptics or academics as Castalio (who in a short tract directed against Calvin had faintly doubted the virtue of public execution for opinions), but even some pious and learned men, and in his work Beza upholds that heretical opinions, that is, opinions not accordant with Calvin's, are to be punished by death or other corporal punishment, on the ground of the excessive atrocity of the crime—the crime of differing from Calvin, and by the force of all precedents in the Jewish and Christian history. Lipsius too about 1590, published a work in which he inveighed against the toleration of more than one religion in a state, and in urging the necessity of punishment for difference of opinion, exclaims, "Burn, cut off some members that the rest may live," and when Koonhest, a man of learning dedicated to the magistrates of Leyden his courageous answer to Lipsius, against the horrid practice of visiting opinions with death, they thought fit to declare by a public act that they did not accept the dedication, so that from 1554 when Calvin vindicated the magistrates and himself for the death of Servetus down to 1590, which was eight years before the edict of Nantes, no Protestant community had any other idea than that those, who under the promise that the Bible was open to all men's construction, ventured to put upon it their own construction differing from that of the majority, were justly deserving of death for their opinions, and as is well said by an English Protestant writer of this day of great learning, "At the end of the 16th century, the simple proposition that men, for holding heterodox opinions in religion, ought not to be burned alive or put to death, was in itself a heresy exposing its defender to punishment, and no one had yet pretended to assert the general right of religious worship which in fact was rarely or never conceded to the Catholics in a Protestant country, though the Huguenots in France shed oceans of blood to secure the same privilege for themselves," of the truth of which conclusion it is not necessary to trouble you with more proofs than have been given, easily as they might be displayed.

In the seventeenth century the state of feeling was but little changed, though towards its close executions or severe corporal punishments, judicially inflicted for religious belief diminished in number in all countries, except England and Scotland, but in none were so much disused as in France, among the Catholics. Still the idea of toleration, that is, of that religious liberty by which each man was entitled publicly to worship God, according to his own tenets, and to believe what he pleased, however absurd and brainless, or wise and gifted he might be, was, it may be said, scarcely conceived; for the most strenuous and boldest of the humane and liberal had gone no further than to deny the wisdom of penal—but more especially of capital punishments for mere private peculiar religious opinions. In the beginning of that century the Arminians, denying the doctrine of predestination, first demanded a public toleration in Holland, where it prevailed, and the great Grotius, in his famous speech to the magistrates, claimed for this sect the free use of the churches upon this particular ground, itself intolerant, that mere separate toleration of sectarian establishments in the same country, rent the bosom of the Church; the result of which claim was that Alten-Barnaveldt, the greatest man and wisest patriot whom Holland had ever produced, the real cause of her independence, and a model of virtue and goodness, was put to death at the age of seventy-four, by judicial sentence, for not believing in predestination. And this same Grotius, one of the men who have most given to Holland her fame, was condemned for the same cause to perpetual imprisonment, from which he only escaped by flying into Sweden. In the same century Fuller in England laments the sympathy which the people showed for Legal and Wightman, who had been burned by James I for their opinions in 1614, which sympathy, however, does not appear in that Protestant country, to have been ever extended to Catholics.

About the middle of that century it seems to have been admitted by some men of learning, among whom was the celebrated Jeremy Taylor, in his Liberty of Prophesying, and it was the extent of their admission, that no matter of mere opinion, nor error of doctrine that was not of itself sin, was to be persecuted or punished by death or corporal suffering. In this sentiment Bayle followed at the close of the century, ridiculing the construction of the text upon which the respective dominant parties had justified their intolerance—"Compel them to come in." But between this admission of Taylor, and simple and complete toleration,—between the total indifference to mere opinions, and the permission to disseminate and uphold them, and worship according to conscience, there is a great gulf which no Protestant country in Europe passed for more than one hundred years afterwards. In some nations indeed the degree of liberality became greater as those of the majority permitted the public worship of other dissenting sects. But taking the great division to be what it always must remain between Protestants and Catholics, in no country, except in France, during the existence of the edict of Nantes, which was repealed about the close of this century, did the civil magistrate permit, nor by the intimate relation still existing between theologians and the municipal law, could he permit the public existence of an adverse religion. The Church of England was crushed by its fellow dissenters (to whom it sacrificed the little that it had in character, doctrine, and in polity), during the great rebellion of 1688, but under neither was the Catholic allowed to shew his own religious belief.

From the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth down to that of the nineteenth century, a period of about two hundred and thirty years, the condition of the Catholics in England (from which country flow so many tirades about toleration, and which habitually preaches a public virtue that it does not practice) was not unlike that of the Protestants of France, during and for about fifty years next after the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Thus in England the Catholic was not allowed by statutes passed as early as the reign of Elizabeth, and invigorated by those of William and Mary about 1695, to depart five miles from his own dwelling; and in France the Protestant was forbidden to fly his country. In each country the one and the other were both forbidden by public acts to appear at court, to practice law or physic, or bear any public office or charge. In England, in the reign of Charles II, Catholic noblemen were deprived of their seats in the house of lords; and in France the very few who remained, were excluded from all military or civil employment. In England Catholics could not rise in the army, the navy, or the law, and those who married otherwise than according to the laws of the establishment, were deprived of their rights in each other's estate, and both incurred a heavy fine, while in France Protestants could not marry except according to the Catholic rite. French children were bribed to be educated by Catholics, and taken from their father's care, if he relapsed into Protestantism. And Catholic English children sent beyond sea to be educated, forfeited all their rights and estates, if they did not renounce their religion in six months after their return. A Catholic who in England would not take the oath against transubstantiation, that is, abjure his religion, was forbidden to keep, under penalty of seizure, any arms, or gunpowder, or a horse above the value of five pounds, was moreover to suffer, by his mere refusal, as a recusant convict, thereby incurring the loss of all his estate and means of life, and being out of the protection by the law, a fate which might consign him to a violent death, and often did consign him to endless imprisonment. But this has no parallel in France. Protestant schools in France, however, were not to be kept within six leagues of any town, and in England a Catholic who kept school was to be condemned to perpetual imprisonment. In England the inheritance of an educated Papist was to be taken from him to pass to his next Protestant relation, but in France no deprivation was allowed for religious differences. Louvois, the savage minister of Louis XIV, wrote to the governors that the troops in the Protestant districts were to be quartered

upon the Huguenots doubly; twenty upon him for ten upon a Catholic. And in 1723, in addition to the double taxes which in England were at all times laid upon Catholics, an act of parliament levied upon them, exclusive of all the rest of the nation, one hundred thousand pounds, equal to about one million five hundred thousand pounds of this day, to pay the expenses of prosecutions for conspiracies, in which, as Catholics merely, they had no concern, and in which those who were implicated were involved with all the Jacobite Protestant party. At any time a Catholic not having lands of twenty marks a year, nor worth forty pounds, must abjure the realm or his religion, and it was felony to remain after a justice of the peace had ordered him to depart. While the baptism of his children by any but a minister of the Church of England, incurred a penalty of one hundred pounds; not participating at communion service once a year, and not attending the established Church service once a month, were visited with the heavy penalty of forty pounds, doubling themselves for each omission. In France the Huguenot meeting-houses were torn down, and the flock was forbidden to worship in public; but in England, in the reign of Elizabeth, to be present at mass, was worth two hundred pounds, and in that of William III, in the year 1700, it cost the same sum; the priest who celebrated it was liable to perpetual imprisonment, and he who detected him received a reward of one hundred pounds. In both countries those who, having once conformed, relapsed, were subject to heavy punishments; and the Catholic who brought into England any thing blessed by the Pope, was liable to a præmunire, that is, to be hanged, drawn and quartered.

In France the Huguenots began to return in about 1740, and no notice was afterwards taken of them by the government, of which Cardinal Henry, the head, checked one or two attempts to revive the ancient quarrels, as is admitted, even by the bigoted Sismondi. Their position in the world did not often induce them to aspire to any offices of state, but they passed their lives in civil security, relieved of vexations, and discreetly veiling their worship from such observation as might have excited disturbance, a prudence more owing to their weakness than their disposition. Since the re-establishment of religion by the Emperor Napoleon, they have equal rights in all respects, though just after the restoration they were involved in some transient difficulties to which they have given the name of a persecution, and which their adversaries deny to have been even ill-treatment. Their number is about a million, as it was at the revocation; their churches are where they choose to place them, and when they require others, which has not happened, except to rebuild those dilapidated by time, they are entitled to the same aid as Catholics, and receive it from the government. Their preachers are also partly supported by the national revenues, as are the Catholics, and whatever new Christian sect arises. But it cannot be said that they increase, that they attract attention, make proselytes, or are popular.

Towards the close of the last century many of the most odious laws in force in England and Ireland against Catholics, were repealed after great and violent opposition. The repeated efforts made by liberal men to revoke their exclusion from high public offices and seats in the houses, were unavailing and defeated until 1828, when the same ministers who had always led the opposition against their emancipation, as it was called, were driven by political combinations to make a voluntary abandonment of their own prejudices, and a vicarious sacrifice of the consciences of their own supporters. The Catholics were then admitted to equal political rights, and the incredulous Englishman, to his own surprise and discomfiture, still finds himself alive, the Inquisition not yet at work, the island unconquered by the forces of the Pope, and her gracious majesty, the defender of the faith, still the head of the Church, and the teeming happy mother of other scarcely less divine offspring.

While, therefore, there existed in England, for the last one hundred years the first Protestant nation of the world, from the year 1570 down to the year 1828, such bitterness as compelled not only the enact-

ment, but the enforcement of such laws, divesting subjects of rank, character, and education, and in all the classes of society, simply because of their religious opinions, of all the rights of the social compact, and all the happiness of life, it is, one does not know whether to say, most wicked or most stupid, to talk of and dwell upon the revocation of the edict of Nantes, as an act of unexampled and unequalled bigotry and atrocity. Whatever bigotry is perceptible in France is more evident in England, as there of a later and more enlightened day. The bishops and priests around Louis XIV in 1655, consented, at least the greater number, to the revocation, but it was an act of the civil authority; and the ministers of the establishment in England, with one or two exceptions, in 1828, opposed the emancipation, and advised George III, at least as bigoted as Louis XIV, that his coronation oath bound him to prevent its relief. The duke of Burgundy, the expectant successor of Louis XIV, approved in 1670, of the revocation, on political reasons exclusively, in a paper which he drew up, and which remains to prove how much France lost in his death. The duke of York opposed emancipation in 1826, he being the presumptive heir to the throne, and bound himself by a solemn pledge, which is not, however, a monument of genius, never to consent to it. But in truth, in France, in 1685, and in England, in 1828, bigotry was not so much the motive, as political necessities and theories.

The reformation in England owes its origin to the amorous desires of Henry VIII, who had determined to marry Anna Boleyn, to do which the divorce by the Pope from Catherine was necessary. This the Pope refused to grant, as against all the principles and practice of the Catholic Church; and the change in religious faith was then enacted by parliament. The power of the crown came in aid of it, under Elizabeth, and those who had refused to acknowledge the divorce by the council, denied of course the legitimacy of Anna's daughter, the really bloody Elizabeth. The consequence was quarrels and bitterness, of which the use was religion, and the motive politics; and the animosity which in all probability would have been soothed, if the mildness of the present day had then prevailed, resulted in fixing Elizabeth, who was certainly, strangely for a Protestant, impressed with the feelings and ideas of a Catholic, in direct and unchangeable opposition to the Catholic religion. It is not at this day pretended that the refusal of the sovereignty of the Pope was then meant to involve, though it led to a total loss of all the marks of a Church. From her reign through all the changes of the times and parties, the Catholics uniformly faithful to the constitution, were courted for a moment by each successive party, only to be rejected or sacrificed. And during all this period, her nobles and her commoners transmitted their faith from generation to generation, with scarcely an instance of abjuration or infidelity. The lapse of time from Elizabeth down to Charles II rather compounded than diminished the sources of hatred; and the national madness and universal folly prevailing in the reign of Charles II and directed against the Catholics, incredible as it is that such delusion should ever have existed, required one hundred and forty years, not to pass away, for one cannot but see around him some traces of its lingering and unwelcome stay, but even to lose its violence and cruelty. And he who wishes to ascertain and compare the toleration of a Catholic and Protestant country, may look to the revocation of the edict of Nantes, where the orders of a government, in perfect keeping with the principles of the age, and the natural cruelty of a soldiery, disapproved of by many of the kingdom, were alleviated and mitigated by all; and to the universal people of England in the reign of Charles II and James II, ready to tear the Catholics to pieces, driving the public officers to persecute and murder them for impossible offences, believing steadily for twenty years that the Jesuits meant to burn down the city of London. Gulled with and wrought to madness by the stupid and ill contrived villainy of Oates and Braloe, staking all that a man was worth in head, heart or estate upon his belief of a divine mystery, not singular in its difficulty, re-

jecting at the same time the speaking evidence of the believer's charity and Christianity in the real protection and assistance which he afforded to the destitute Huguenots who sought refuge in England, and sustaining a nobleman when he declared as a legislator that "he would not have so much as a Popish man nor a Popish woman, to remain here, not so much as a Popish dog, or a Popish bitch,—nay, not so much as a Popish cat, to pur and mew about the king;" a speech which gained him great honor in his day, from his intelligent and liberal countrymen, and for which or for any thing like it, Louis XIV, or any French gentleman would have been laughed out of the kingdom of France.

From this time through the reigns of William and Anne they were the objects of most severe enactments and prosecutions, directed against them as supporters of the Stewarts, and after the final destruction of the hopes of that family in 1745, they are not heard of as connected with politics, nor in fact in any way until the No-Popery riots of 1780. But in the interval the power of the establishment had at first so completely engrossed the public mind, and the rise of other sects had afterwards so divided it, that the Catholics were looked upon as almost insolent when they claimed to be Englishmen, and as rebels when they asked to come into parliament. The gross conceptions of their adversaries had spread through the nation, falsehoods so dull and obvious, that it requires great credulity to believe that any man could have been so stupid and so ignorant as to give them credit. But the few had in the meantime become liberal, and down to 1828 Catholic emancipation was the watchword of the enlightened. From the event of the repeal of those badges of intolerance yet remaining in a country which is suffered to teach us, they have gone on in peace, spreading themselves with humility and charity, and dispelling the errors which ignorance and spite had disseminated and almost planted in the nation.

In like manner in France, though the opposition of the Catholics was at first exclusively directed against the tenets of the new religionists, yet gradually political interests were mingled with, and perhaps increased this repugnance into hatred. The dukes of Guise were sincerely and most faithfully attached to their own religion, and headed the Catholic party. They were men of great courage, skill, gallantry, eminently gifted with all the more brilliant and generous qualities of the head and heart, so imposing and splendid in their exterior that in their presence all other princes were insignificant, and possessing also all the traits which command the confidence and attract the affection of equals and inferiors. No subject ever rose to so great power in spite of, and against the will of a monarch, as Henry duke of Guise, without shaking the order of the monarchy, and but for his participation in the St. Bartholomew massacre, to which if it is any excuse he lent himself to revenge his father's murder, none ever left a grander reputation, but it was the intention of his family to ascend the throne, on the death of Henry III, in exclusion of Henry IV. In this view he was supported by the will of the people, and in it he probably would have succeeded but that Henry III, whose imbecile vanity he had wounded, privately assassinated him and his brother. The remaining brother the duke de Mayenne preserved the same intention, and headed the Catholic armies against Henry IV, whose abjuration of Calvinism weakened the duke, and after Henry had ascended the throne, the same elements of religious and political hatred remained to embitter the followers of each sect. At the time of the revocation, their religion which had made no progress in France was not so much the object of attack, as their preference of a republican government, and their connection with foreign nations, which it can scarcely be questioned, it was the honest and natural duty of the government of France to oppose and even punish, and after this revocation had worked its effect in breaking up and shivering their party and designs, the Protestants about 1745, returned to and remained in France in complete security, which a few years afterwards by the unanimous consent of the kingdom was extended into, and is now perfect and

ENGRAVED BY J. SARTAIN

Very respectfully
Yours Wm Jenkins

entire equality, not only by law but by the charity and good feeling of the people.

From this brief and imperfect sketch of the progress of toleration it may be seen that, odious as bigotry must always be, it is comparatively harmless when civil rights or political interests are not connected with it, and that when men's religious belief is made the ground of affecting their rights, their interests, or even their tempers, the usual result has been violence and civil war, that it is but of late that the principle of toleration has been recognized in Protestant countries, that though some at this day admit that a man may believe in doctrines in which they do not coincide without being a bad citizen, yet in this they do but imitate the example of Catholic countries, and that certain as it is, and even declared by law, it is not yet universally and sincerely felt that the faith of no one sect, when it is tolerated, leads to injustice or crime, to tyranny, or to dissension.

But the right of public toleration is not enough, without the acknowledgment of its principle, which is charity. To no one sect is it given to limit its duties now to expound and describe the rights—social, legal, or municipal—of others. In this matter among us the majority has no more value than the smallest quantity. Nor can a union of all against one find either its justification in numbers or authority, or its excuse in hasty passion, shallow judgment, or even in the forgetfulness of all that their Bible and all Christianity dictate. To the timorous must be left their fears, to the ignorant their prejudices, to the vain their glory of opposition, and to the unworthy their desire of a vulgar and antichristian popularity. But if even madness should so rule the hour, that the union of all these and surely none others could join in such a purpose, shall tend to the oppression, the persecution, the violation of the rights of any religious class, then, instead of fears, or doubts, or hostile alliances, the persecuted may safely trust to the good sense and honor of the community, and well believe that their foolish adversaries will only sooner lose their power to do harm, that their efforts will be bounded by their magnanimity, while their silly design to alarm the community by fears of a creed, will be heartily laughed at by the sensible men of their own belief, and entirely forgiven and forgotten by the objects of their generous and enlightened hatred.

---

## MEMOIR OF THE LATE WILLIAM JENKINS.

"Time rolls his ceaseless course. The race of yore
Who danced our infancy upon their knee,"
* * * * *
"How are they blotted from the things that be!
How few, all weak and withered of their force.
Wait on the verge of dark eternity,
Like stranded wrecks, the tide returning hoarse,
To sweep them from our sight!"

*Scott.*

PERHAPS no man now living, has been identified for so long a period with the Catholic Church in Baltimore, as was the subject of this memoir. One of the oldest trustees of St. Peter's and the Cathedral congregation, and one of the most useful, enterprising, and exemplary members of the board, he enjoyed the confidence and esteem of the venerable Archbishop Carroll, and of each of the succeeding prelates of the see of Baltimore. He was one of that small number of Catholics who worshipped in the first humble building known as St. Peter's church,—then the only Catholic church in Baltimore; and he continued for more than sixty years a member of the same congregation, until he saw the stately Cathedral and several other beautiful Catholic churches

crowded with worshippers. No Catholic in Maryland was more extensively known among his brethren; and though none was more frequently appealed to for aid in the building of churches, the support of missions and the many other works of benevolence which make pecuniary aid indispensable, his hand was ever ready to dispense the wealth with which God had blessed his industrious and virtuous life.

As a patriarch among the Catholics of Maryland, and so long connected with the history of Catholicity in this state, a notice of Mr. Jenkins seems an appropriate subject for these pages, while the exemplary discharge of his duties as a fervent Catholic and a good citizen, presents him as a model for imitation, worthy of the study of those who would seek to "live soberly, justly and godly, in this world," and prove that the Catholic religion is not less suited to the stirring scenes of active life, than to the retirement of the cloister.

William Jenkins was born in 1766, at "Long Green," in Baltimore county, upon an estate which his uncle, Courtenay Jenkins, had obtained by patent from the lord proprietary of Maryland, about the year 1740. His ancestors having emigrated from Great Britain to escape the persecutions against Catholics, had established themselves as early as 1660, at the head of St. Mary's river. His grandfather intermarried with the daughter of Captain Thomas Courtenay.

The Protestant ascendancy in Maryland, which, in 1692, made the Church of England the established Church of the colony, *by law;* in 1704 passed "An act to prevent the growth of Popery within the province," by which all bishops or priests of the Catholic Church, were inhibited, under severe penalties, from saying mass, or exercising their spiritual functions, and Catholics were prohibited from engaging in the instruction of youth. In the language of the impartial and eloquent McMahon, "thus, in a colony which was established by Catholics, and grew up to power and happiness under the government of a Catholic, *the Catholic inhabitant was the only victim of religious intolerance.*"*

* History of Maryland, p. 246.

Michael, the father of Mr. Jenkins, with his two brothers, Courtenay and Ignatius, annoyed and impoverished by the restrictions imposed upon them on account of their religion, removed to Baltimore county,—then regarded as a remote, as it was a sparsely inhabited part of the province; hoping in an obscure location, to practise their faith with less molestation, and to escape in some measure the exactions and penalties imposed upon "*Popish recusants.*" At a later date, his other paternal uncles, except Austin, who became a priest, and died in his native country, migrated to the western states. The father married the niece of Mr. Ignatius Wheeler, a wealthy Catholic gentleman of Harford county, descended from the first settlers of Maryland.

The ancestors of William Jenkins had flourished under the paternal government of the Calverts, and suffered persecution under the Protestant ascendancy, but neither prosperity, the hope of reward, nor pains and penalties, ever caused them to swerve from that which they cherished above all things, the faith for which they had forsaken their parent land.

From early childhood the subject of this memoir was distinguished for gentleness and piety, united to great firmness and energy. Though but a child at the commencement of our revolutionary struggle, he glowed with enthusiasm for his country's success. He has often related to his children, as illustrating the spirit of those times of peril and glory, that his country schoolmaster, who had scarcely a boy over ten years of age, would, after the school exercises were over, form his little scholars in military array, and arming them with sticks and corn stalks, teach them the "art of war," to prepare them for future service. About the close of the war of independence, having attained his thirteenth year, and perceiving that the means of his father would be insufficient for his numerous offspring, he determined to visit Baltimore, and there become the artificer of his own fortune. He entered as an apprentice to the tanning business, under William Hayward, a member of the Society of Friends, of whom he always spoke with respect; the

latter used to boast of his boy Billy, as the best of apprentices, and as a man, his best friend. Very soon after completing his apprenticeship, he commenced business on his own account.

With a cash capital of two hundred dollars, borrowed from his father, and with the more efficient aid of industry and temperance, he established himself in his trade, on Water street, at the place where he continued to transact business for fifty-five years. His probity and strict attention soon secured him the good will of all with whom he had dealings, and prospering in his first attempt he was soon able to extend his business with the success that usually attends prudence and application. But his prospects were suddenly darkened by a calamity that would have discouraged men of less fortitude.

Nearly all his capital being invested in the stock of a tan yard which he had rented, an accidental fire totally destroyed his property. Not being insured—for there was no insurance company in Baltimore, in those days—his loss was very severe. But that energy which gave so much manliness to his character, displayed itself in this severe disappointment of his youthful hopes.

Relying upon Divine Providence, to whose visitation he bowed with Christian submission, he began the world again; and by the aid of his naturally clear understanding and sound judgment, with the advantages acquired by his late experience in business, and the physical powers of a hardy and robust constitution, he soon found himself in possession of as much as he had lost. Devoting himself with great assiduity to business, he became one of the most useful citizens, and contributed to build up the trade and promote the prosperity of Baltimore: whose success in commerce, and rapid growth in the quarter of a century that succeeded the revolution were astonishing. Of his own branch of business, which became one of the most useful to that city, he may be regarded as the founder, and in which he lived to be more extensively engaged for many years than any other person in the state. A high character for integrity, and his just and liberal conduct, gave him the highest credit, which he used with prudence and intelligence. He took pride in advancing the interests of the leather trade in Baltimore, and when he had introduced any new process or machinery, took pleasure in making known their advantages to others, inviting them with true liberality to avail themselves of his improvements. He took pleasure in assisting young men in whom he discovered industry and talents for business, not a few of whom can date their success in after life to his judicious counsel and efficient aid. As a kind master he had no superior. During the prevalence of yellow fever in 1798, or 1800, he had several apprentices, one of whom contracting the fatal disease was nursed by his kind master with a parent's care, and although the fever was at that time believed to be contagious, Mr. Jenkins slept in the same room, and sometimes in the same bed, and never left him until he was carried off by the fatal disease. It is in acts like these, to which the God of charity never fails to give his blessing, that we can recognize the true Christian.

He showed the sincerity and strength of his faith, by his exact observance of all that the Church enjoins, and he found in the faithful performance of his religious duties, the best protection against the dissipation and the allurements to vice with which his youth was surrounded. In a conversation with the writer, two or three years before his death, he stated that although often solicited by his companions to mingle with bad company, he had preserved his virtue unsullied amidst the temptations of youth.

He performed with exemplary public spirit the duties of a good citizen. At the commencement of the last war, although exempted by age from military duty, he became a member of a volunteer troop of cavalry, under Captain Thompson, and performed an active part in the defence of Baltimore in 1814. During that exciting time, when the patriotism of Baltimore shone with conspicuous lustre, there were trials more severe than those of battle: when heads of families were separated for several days from their homes, while the timid wife and mother, and helpless children were

uncertain of the fate of that being who was most dear to them on earth. When the troop was on duty at North Point, a few days before the battle, a rumor reached the city that the enemy had landed during the night, and attacking Cap. Thompson's troop had cut it to pieces. Who can describe the feelings of the wife and mother at such a moment! Fortunately Mr. Jenkins having been ordered to the city on special duty, soon relieved the anxiety of the families of his fellow-soldiers, and having obtained permission to visit his own family, his sudden appearance brought joy to his home. Throwing aside his uniform and accoutrements to snatch a moment's repose, he found when rising to resume them, that the fond wife, scarce recovered from her late alarm, had secreted them, and no persuasion could induce her to restore them. She plead his legal exemption from duty, &c., and he unable to prevail against her gentle violence, re-mounted his horse, and in citizen's dress, returned to his post at the appointed time, and reported himself for duty. He had four brothers in the field as volunteers during the defence. Knowing that two of them were in a most exposed situation during the battle, and missing his foreman, also a volunteer, he undertook the painful task of searching among the dead and wounded for them.

A beautiful trait in his character was his love for his brothers. During the illness of the youngest of them, who lived at a distance of sixteen miles, Mr. Jenkins would leave the city in the afternoon regardless of the state of the weather, watch by his brother's bedside the greatest part of every night, and returning to the city the following morning, resume his attention to business.

There was a charm about the domestic life of Mr. Jenkins that never failed to impress visitors. In fact it was at home—at his beautiful seat, Oak-hill, that his character was exhibited in its true lustre; not only in dispensing the rites of hospitality to others with cordial satisfaction, but in the gentle government of his numerous family. It appeared to be his successful aim to make *home* the happiest place on earth to his children. While the example of his habits of temperance and industry, and his regular performance of the exercises of religion commanded the veneration of all who witnessed the uniform excellence of his well spent life, he encouraged rational mirth and the indulgence of the exuberance of youthful spirits by the pleasure he manifested in seeing all around him happy. Like a crystal vase filled with wine, in which the generous contents give a glow to the sparkling purity of the exterior—the kindness of his heart gave both sweetness to his manners, and grace to his virtue.

In April 1842, he was visited by a slight paralytic attack. He received the visitation with pious submission, as a warning to prepare for death, and immediately applied himself to the final arrangement of his temporal and spiritual affairs. Although he partially recovered from the effects of the disease, so as to give his family and friends hopes that his life might be spared for several years, he devoted himself with renewed earnestness to prayer, and to the reception of the sacraments.

In February, 1843, he had a second attack, and felt conscious his end was approaching. In the full possession of his intellectual powers, he disposed himself for the end of life with calm piety, profound humility, and trust in God, and on the 21st of February, breathed his last, in the seventy-seventh year of his age.

All persons engaged in the branch of trade of which he was considered the father, closed their places of business, through respect for his memory, and the immense number who, amid inclement weather, attended his funeral, testified the general veneration in which the upright man had been held by the community which had known him best.

# INTELLIGENCE.

## FOREIGN.

PUSEYISM IN ENGLAND.—On Sunday last Dr. Pusey preached to a large congregation at Christ church, and publicly, and without reserve, professed and taught the great fundamental doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, namely, *Transubstantiation*. The text was that which describes the institution of the Lord's supper, by our Lord (Matt. xxvi, 26, 27, 28, compared with John vi, 54). Dr. Pusey took these texts in the literal sense in which the gross-minded Jews and uninstructed disciples took them, and for which they were rebuked by our Lord. In the first part of his sermon, Dr. Pusey adopted the precise line of argument employed by Dr. Wiseman in his volume published in the year 1836, and which consisted of lectures delivered at the English college at Rome. Following Dr. Wiseman, Dr. Pusey maintained that on consecrating the elements of bread and wine, a change took place, but the *mode* of which it is presumptuous to inquire, but which we were to regard as a wonderful mystery, that it should be bread and wine, and yet the *very* body and blood of Christ. In support of these statements Dr. Pusey quoted the language of the *Council of Trent*, sess. xiii, c. 3 and 4. It may be remarked here that Dr. Turton, the able and learned dean of Westminster, in his work on the eucharist, has ably criticised the principles of interpretation adopted by Dr. Wiseman, but of these criticisms Dr. Pusey took not the least notice.

The second part of his sermon was on the *Communication of the remission of sins;* and here the reader will perceive comes the awful and practical part of the subject. *Transubstantiation* is not a barren, inoperative speculation, but constitutes a system of divinity, and determines the whole character of the revelation of God's will to man;—and Dr. Pusey went necessarily the whole length of the argument, and labored to show that the "remission of sins" referred not only to the atonement on the cross, by the one offering of the body of Christ, but also to the celebration of the Lord's supper; here again he quoted "*the ancient Church*," as authority. This doctrine is also maintained in Tract 90, as we noticed at the time, this tract asserting "that there is nothing in the thirty-first article against the mass in itself, or against its being an offering for the remission of sin, when considered as a continuation of Christ's sacrifice."—P. 63, first edition.

Consistently with these views, Dr. Pusey, in practically applying his subject, spoke of the Lord's supper as the means of continuing and maintaining the spiritual life imparted in baptism; and urged to more frequent communion, both on the part of "the *holy*" and of *sinners;* the former that they may enjoy an antipast of heaven; the latter that they might, peradventure, obtain the remission of sins.—*Tablet?*

In consequence of the expression of these opinions, Dr. Pusey was required to submit his sermon to the consideration of a *board of heresy*. What the result will be is yet uncertain.

THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND.—The secession of those ministers of the Church of Scotland who protest against the interference of the civil power in ecclesiastical matters, has at length occurred. At the meeting of the general assembly, Dr. Welsh, the ex-moderator, read a statement, couched in the most temperate language, of the reasons which had induced the dissentients to separate themselves from the Church. Immediately after its perusal the seceders vacated the assembly and convened a meeting of their own, over which the celebrated Dr. Chalmers was elected to preside. The protest was signed by three hundred and ninety-five ministers, among whom may be found the most eloquent, zealous, and scholar-like personages of whom Presbyterianism can boast. Towards the erection and endowment of the churches in which these ministers must henceforth officiate, handsome contributions have been made, and in some instances by benefactors who, though they are opposed to the principle, the maintenance of which has effected the schism, cannot forbear admiring the disinterested integrity of the men who have created it.

The disruption arose from a dispute as to the right of the civil courts to interfere in clerical matters, on the one hand; and on the other from the dread that if the spiritual courts once assumed authority, they might dexterously and eagerly usurp and entrench upon the prerogatives of all other tribunals.

It was a bad day for Scotland when this rupture occurred. It will require years of patient conciliation and anxious labor to atone for the mischief which this feud has done. All the

clergymen whom the non-intrusionists, when they had a majority in the assembly, had deposed, have been reinstated.

There remain seven hundred and thirty-three parish ministers, and one hundred and two ministers of chapels, who adhere to the establishment.—*Catholic Herald.*

CANADA.—*Conversions.*—The return of a great number of Protestants to the Catholic Church is a fact worthy of remark, at the present time, and which excites the attention of the world. We do not receive a religious journal from the United States, England, France, &c. which does not tell us of numerous conversions in every part of those countries, among all classes of society.

It is only the Catholic journals of Lower Canada which have not as yet spoken of like conversions. It is not to be inferred, therefore, that there have been none, or that they have been very rare.

It has been proven that during the cholera of 1832, there were no fewer than eighty Protestants who solicited the assistance of the clergy, and embraced the Catholic faith upon the bed of death, in the city of Quebec alone. We have been informed that at least an equal number of Protestants died Catholics in Montreal during the same visitation.

But when we say that the conversions are frequent, we do not intend to speak of conversions made under those extraordinary circumstances, in the last hour of life; at that hour when we fear God alone, and when we have in view no other interests than those of the soul—we wish to mention only the conversions which are made daily, and which are found recorded on the registry of the parish.

Those registries verify that *four hundred and eighteen* Protestants made abjuration of their faith, in the parish of Quebec alone, in 1826. Many of those converts were the fathers and mothers of families, where the conversion naturally included that of their children; but those children are not comprised in this number. There have been at least twenty-four conversions per year, in the parish of Quebec, since 1826.

During the last there are counted forty-one, and in the month of January of this year, there were registered twenty. We can judge from this of the number of conversions which are made during the year, in other parts of the province, and it is easy to see that the religious movement that leads the Protestants to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church, is no less manifest in Canada than in other countries.

The proof that this religious movement in Canada is not limited to the towns of Quebec and Montreal, and is besides of a date as recent as that we have just indicated, is found in the report, read and adopted the 6th of March, 1843, at the "First Anniversary of the Association of the Presbyterian Congregations of Montreal, in aid of Missions," and published in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 18th of April, and in the *Herald* of the twentieth. The members of the Presbyterian Association of Montreal, ministers and laity, orthodox and dissenting, proclaim to the world, in this official report, that "*the majority—nearly the whole*"—of the Protestant settlers in the time of the first establishment of English ascendancy in Canada, have either embraced the Catholic faith, or else ceased to believe in the different forms of Protestantism which were imported with them, and that their descendants have naturally followed their example.—*N. Y. Freeman's Journal.*

*Education.*—We extract the following information relative to the brothers of the Christian schools, from a letter lately received in Baltimore.

"You will learn with pleasure the prosperous state in which the establishment of the brothers is at present in Montreal. They have actually ten classes, containing in all more than one thousand and fifty pupils. In the month of September, they will begin three new classes, which will carry the number of pupils to about fourteen hundred. We are in the community, brothers and novices together, twenty-seven. The institute of the brothers counted last year four hundred establishments, composed of more than three thousand subjects. Four of the members will open another at Quebec in the month of September."

## DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALTIMORE.—On Sunday the 18th of June, the Most Rev. Archbishop administered the sacrament of confirmation in the Cathedral, to upwards of five hundred persons, from the different parishes of the city. So large a number had never before been confirmed in the Cathedral at one time. Of those who received the sacrament, one hundred and fifty were converts to our holy faith during the past year.

*Ordination.*—The Rt. Rev. Bishop Purcell administered the sacrament of confirmation on Ascension Thursday to sixty persons in the Catholic church of Frederick, Maryland; on the next morning seven ecclesiastical students of the Jesuit noviceship were tonsured and eight received the Minor Orders.

On Saturday the same prelate administered confirmation in the church of St. Joseph, in the happy valley of the Sisters of Charity. On last

Sunday the bishop sang high mass in the parish church of Mount St. Mary's college, and administered the sacrament of confirmation to sixty persons, among whom were several converts.

*School Excursion.*—On Wednesday the 21st of June, feast of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, the children attached to the schools of St. Vincent de Paul's church in Baltimore, made an excursion to a very pleasant country retreat at a short distance from the city, where they spent the day in innocent amusement, under the supervision of the ladies and gentlemen of the Sunday school, and the sisters of charity. Rev. Mr. Gildea, pastor of St. Vincent's, was in attendance during a part of the day. In proceeding to the place of recreation the children marched two by two in bands conducted by their respective leaders, and attracted universal attention as they passed along the street. We understand that there were nearly eight hundred in the line.

*Donations.*—In the report of the donations to the Cathedral which were published last month in the Magazine, those of Messrs. Peter A. Kelly and T. Robert Jenkins, each fifty dollars, were omitted through mistake. Mr. Joseph Jenkins has since contributed one hundred dollars.

Diocess of Boston.—The corner stone of a new church was recently laid at South Boston.

Diocess of New York.—*School Election.*—It gives us great pleasure to announce that the recent election has been a signal triumph for the friends of the law. Notwithstanding all the opposition and abuse of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Advertiser, "which have achieved for themselves an infamous notoriety," the friends of the system carried their whole ticket *in nine out of the seventeen wards* and better than half their candidates in three or four others, thus giving them a decided majority. Deacon Hale made a dead set at the fourteenth ward, but his friends were defeated by an average majority of two hundred.—*Cath. Telegraph.*

The majority of the candidates are opposed to the use of the Bible in the public schools.

Diocess of Philadelphia.—The corner stone of a new church was laid on the 8th of June at Lambertville, by Rev. Dr. Moriarty.

The same ceremony took place in Paradise township, York county, Pa. on the 18th.

Puseyism in the American Church.—The correspondent of the N. York Commercial, giving an account of the late Episcopal convention at Baltimore, respecting the charge by the Right Rev. Bishop Whittingham, remarks, "that whilst there was much in it to make the heart of every Christian rejoice, the general scope and tendency of his 'charge' gave great grief to very many members of the convention, and a very large portion of his lay auditory. It is true he repelled with considerable warmth, and with all his emphatic power of expression, the arbitrary imputation of 'Puseyism' upon the doctrines he has felt it for some years, and now feels it his duty to promulgate and maintain. He urged his views also most unquestionably, in the most guarded and cautious language. But still, the general scope and tendency, on the whole were such, that had Dr. Pusey been present, or any of the Oxford Tractarians, I am afraid the 'charge' would have been considered highly favorable to their tenets. Most certainly it would have aroused the opposition of Archbishop Whately, and would have startled those fathers of the American Episcopal Church—Bishop White and Bishop Griswold. The consequence was, that the charge was by no means favorably received by the majority of the convention. The usual resolution for ordering it to be printed was adopted, as a matter of course—but when a member proposed a vote of thanks to the Bishop for his able and *sound* exposition of the doctrine of the Church, so much opposition was manifested, that it was deemed expedient by the mover to withdraw it. The Rev. Dr. Henshaw, especially, declared with great force that, if it was not withdrawn, it would certainly be voted down."—*Phil. paper.*

The Methodist Protestant.—We receive an exchange paper with this title, published in Baltimore, which for a considerable period evinced a spirit of charity and moderation that is always essential to the dignity and usefulness of the press. But we have lately perceived a decided alteration for the worse in the character of this print, which is probably owing to the transfer of the editorship to unpractised hands. We say *a decided alteration for the worse*, because in the paper of the 27th of May, in addition to grossly ignorant allusions regarding the knowledge of the Scriptures in Portugal, we find the following beautiful display of rhetoric:

"We see nothing of Papacy in the United States. It has scarely thrust its nose through our national hedge of piety and common sense: but if we fail to rap it well, and beat back the Beast, ere long it may work a breach large enough to leap through upon us, in full size and strength, and then wo to our weal! We will be but a mouthful for its rapacious jaws. Popery, however, is not restricted to Romanists."

Here is learning indeed! The author of this literary gem may not, perhaps, see in the United States that papal *bugaboo* that is sometimes conjured up as an object of salutary dread and pious

lamentation for the ignorant; but if he alludes to the spiritual supremacy of the bishop of Rome, he must know that the Catholics of the U. States glory in their communion with him, as the head of the Christian Church. We are not of opinion, however, that the *Methodist Protestant* and his brethren have any reason to be alarmed at their becoming "a mouthful for the rapacious jaws of popery," as the inviolable union existing among the constituent portions of the *Reformation society*, *v. g.* between Methodist ministers and Presbyterian *bishops*, will have the effect of preventing any other absorption of Protestantism into Catholicity, than by the gentle modes of unbiassed inquiry and peaceful conversion, as is daily witnessed in this country and elsewhere.

A number of the same paper, published June 17th, contains some strictures upon the corporeal penances that are reported to be practised among the Mexican Catholics. As to the peculiar manner in which bodily penance may be exercised in certain places, or by certain individuals, the Catholic Church has nothing to do with it; but the voluntary exercise of penance in general she does approve, and there are some practices which she even commands, and in all this she is sustained by the example of St. Paul, who "chastised his body and reduced it into subjection," as well as of the whole Christian Church, from its very origin. Is not such penance, therefore, founded upon Scriptural authority, and if so, how can the *Methodist Protestant* undertake to assert that "the Papal faith is calculated to encourage this evil (superstition), rather than to suppress it?" Pray, what is superstition? It is a false or extravagant worship. Corporal penance, therefore, having the sanction of apostolic usage, is not superstitious, nor does it encourage superstition. But what are the *Camp-meetings* announced in the very same number of this paper, to be held shortly in various places? Were they instituted by our Saviour or by his apostles? If not, they must be extravagant and superstitious according to those Christians who profess to practise only what the Saviour commanded. The fact is superstition is rather delicate ground for them to tread upon who consider a tremendous ranting and an extraordinary excitement of the nerves, as an evidence of an interior conversion to God. Such individuals may be benefitted by reflecting upon the following words of our Lord: "Cast out the beam out of thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

## OBITUARY.

Died, on Friday, the 2d inst., at the Institution of the Sisters of Charity, near Emmittsburg, Md., Sister Mary Maurice, eldest daughter of Mr. William Whelan of Philadelphia.

## EDITORIAL REMARKS.

Our Magazine opens this month with a paper highly interesting by the nature of the topics which it presents to the reader. The work of Mr. Faber, which it reviews, is an index to the actual state of theological sentiment among a large number in the university of Oxford, and shows that the sympathy of the learned gentlemen in that quarter, with the teachings of the ancient Church, are gradually becoming stronger and more manifest. From the spirit that pervades this book, we should infer that it would be very easy for an Oxford divine to take the stand which has lately exhibited Dr. Pusey as an advocate of Catholic doctrine. One thing is certain that these ministers are not so committed as their brethren on this side of the Atlantic in holding forth the book of Ratramn, as antagonist to the doctrine of transubstantiation. This work of Ratramn has been recently published in Baltimore, and the remarks of the *True Catholic* upon it have also appeared, with a view to produce this impression. The reader will perceive from the review of the work in this number of the Magazine, how utterly unfounded are these pretensions of our dissenting brethren.

The able article of Robert Hare, Esq., of Philadelphia, on the *Edict of Nantes*, will be read with great pleasure by all who love to see historical truth vindicated from the misrepresentations of ignorance or malevolence.

We acknowledge the reception of No. 6 of *Catholic Melodies*, an *Invocation to the Virgin*, and an excellent article on a middle state of punishment, from the pen of our reverend friend in Washington city, whose essays on the eucharist have afforded so much gratification to our readers.

In the August number will appear a review of Prescott's history of Ferdinand and Isabella, from a learned correspondent, to whom we are also indebted for several other valuable papers.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 18610 2

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.